God.
225
Dav/Int
59283

00059283

NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE.

Royal Asiatic Society.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 17 February, 2016

AN

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

NEW TESTAMENT;

CONTAINING

AN EXAMINATION OF THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE AUTHORITY, INTERPRETATION, AND INTEGRITY OF THE CANONICAL BOOKS, WITH REFERENCE TO THE LATEST INQUIRIES.

BY

SAMUEL DAVIDSON, LL.D.

59283

VOLUME I.

THE FOUR GOSPELS.

ΠΟΛΛΑΙ μεν θνητοις ΓΛΩΤΤΑΙ, μια δ'αθανατοισιν.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OFFICE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

LONDON:
SAMUEL BAGSTER AND SONS;
WAREHOUSE FOR BIBLES, NEW TESTAMENTS, PRAYER-BOOKS, LEXICONS, GRAMMARS, CONCORDANCES, AND PSALTERS, IN ANCIENT AND MODERN LANGUAGES;
PATERNOSTER ROW.

M.DCCC.XLVIII.

God
225
Dav/Int
59283

LONDON:
PRINTED BY J. WERTHEIMER AND CO.,
CIRCUS PLACE, FINSBURY CIRCUS.

IT IS TO THE LEARNED THAT I ADDRESS MYSELF, OR IF IT BE THOUGHT THAT THE LEARNED ARE NOT THE BEST UMPIRES AND JUDGES OF SUCH THINGS, I SHOULD AT LEAST WISH TO SUBMIT MY OPINION TO MEN OF A MATURE AND MANLY UNDERSTANDING, POSSESSING A THOROUGH KNOWLEDGE OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE GOSPEL; ON WHOSE JUDGMENTS I SHOULD RELY WITH FAR MORE CONFIDENCE, THAN ON THOSE OF NOVICES IN THESE MATTERS. — *Milton.*

Es bedarf anjetzt eines neuen Anfangs über die Bildung des Neuteſtamentlichen. — *Neander.*

PREFACE.

THE subjects discussed in the following pages are of primary importance to the student of the Bible. They are closely connected with the foundation of his faith in Christianity, and consequently of his higher aspirations after the True and the Eternal. Hence the Author does not think it desirable or necessary to apologise for this new attempt to illustrate them.

What the Germans call *Introduction* has not engaged many minds in this country, owing to a variety of causes which it were superfluous to detail. Probably too little attention has been given to theological literature in England. There are few books on it in our language. Every one familiar with the modern works published by theologians and critics in various lands and languages knows, that there is no English book which gives a fair or adequate idea of the present state of opinion in this department. The Author therefore proposes to supply a want which many doubtless feel; and in regard to which it is not always expedient to direct the young theologian to the most recent publications in Germany.

It is matter of congratulation, that the class of inquiring Bible students is rapidly increasing. Amid the conflict of opinions truth must always eventually prevail. The Scriptures will bear and repay the closest investigation. In the light of a true philosophy guided by an humble spirit, they will shine out with a fairer lustre. And yet there are many well-meaning

men who entirely discourage the reading of such books as contain new researches into the region of theological science, especially those written in the German language. They denounce them as dangerous. They sound the alarm of heresy. They raise the cry of an *infallible*, *anathematising* ignorance. But in the mean time curiosity is excited. Men's sympathies are drawn in the direction of the accused. The depreciated books are read *in spite of* denouncements, or rather all the more eagerly *because of* them; and their essence is reproduced in English works. On this account, it seems to be the wiser course to prepare for all the objections that may be urged against the New Testament. It is better even to anticipate the diffusion of certain subtle cavils in the field of Christianity than to decry them at a distance, or to be overwhelmed by their novelty when they are fairly imported from other lands.

It is the Writer's belief that the books of the New Testament are destined ere long to pass through a severe ordeal. The translations of various Continental works which have recently appeared in England, and the tendency of certain speculations in philosophy, indicate a refined scepticism or a pantheistic spirit which confounds *the objective* and *the subjective*, or *unduly subordinates* the former to the latter. Many are disposed to exalt their *intuitions* too highly, to the detriment of *the historical*, as Kant did his "Pure Reason."

These observations will serve to shew why the Author has gone with considerable fulness into objections that have been urged in modern times against the New Testament books, and especially against the Gospels. He thinks it highly probable that such objections will appear in one shape or other in this country. Hence he has partially anticipated their currency. It is true that they are known to a few English scholars even now; but they are destined to be more widely circulated. Perhaps most

of those who are at present acquainted with them are able to set a right value on them without having their minds injured; but the circumstances of the case must change in proportion as the sceptical considerations in question are revealed to a wider circle, unless pains be taken to send a sufficient antidote along with them.

The Author had considerable difficulty in judging of the things which were considered fit to be noticed. Many may think that he has given too much space to arguments in themselves worthless or trifling. It is very true, that the opponents with whom he has to deal seem generally incapable of estimating evidence at its proper value; but many of their observations could not be passed by, however light they may appear in the eyes of other inquirers. Let it be remembered, that the Author intended to compose an Introduction which should bear *a comprehensive* aspect—a work on the New Testament, having regard to the progress of investigation not merely in one nation, but in many—and he will be exculpated from the charge of having too much respect to the weak arguments of recent writers. His plan could not have been carried out without noticing, in a greater or less degree, the phases through which the sacred books have passed, amid the scrutiny to which they have been subjected by those who have entered into the field occupied by Introduction. Hence the Author has noticed the researches of the Tübingen school of theologians, not from a desire to make known extravagant and startling assertions to an English Public, but because his work would not otherwise have been complete; and because he thinks it not improbable that similar doubts may be introduced into England, and may meet with acceptance from certain minds which are predisposed to welcome *the new* and *the destructive* however intrinsically false.

Respecting the peculiarities of diction characteristic of each

sacred writer, the Author feels that much has yet to be done, even after the labours of Gersdorf, Fritzsche, Credner, Wilke, and Winer; and he repeats Tholuck's wish, that the last-named scholar would turn his attention to the subject particularly. "The Grammar of the New Testament Idiom" shews how fully competent he is to do it justice. In our own country, Mr. Green might undertake the same topic. The philosophical ability and scholarship displayed in "A Treatise on the Grammar of the New Testament Dialect"—a volume which we strongly recommend to every critical student of the New Testament—are an earnest of the taste and skill which he could bring to bear on the interesting inquiry alluded to.

One part of what is embraced by *Introduction* is omitted in the following work, viz., *the Criticism of the Text*, because it is treated of in another publication bearing the title, "Lectures on Biblical Criticism." The Author purposes, as soon as he can find leisure, to re-write that work, which has been out of print for a considerable time, and to bring it up to the present state of the science by subjecting the whole to a thorough revision. The Reader who will sometimes find a different opinion advocated in the Introduction from that proposed in the Lectures, must attribute the change to a more careful examination of evidence. The Writer is not ashamed to alter his sentiments when he sees good reasons for doing so. He is unappalled by the charge of inconsistency which may be brought against him. Others may sympathise with the stereotype-minded; *he* cannot do so as long as he inquires and reflects. He adopts the motto of the man who proclaims, *dies diem docet*, rather than the sentiment of him who creeps along all his life in the ruts of hereditary or prevailing opinion.

A few other points have been omitted, because they appeared of trifling importance, or unsuited to the mind of the British theologian. Those acquainted with the most recent German Introduc-

tions, such as those of Neudecker, De Wette, and Guerike, will readily see, that the reader is not thus deprived of any real benefit.

The first volume, containing the Gospels, is published by itself, chiefly because the Author foresaw, that if he waited till the entire work were completed, he should probably be obliged, in accordance with his plan, to change a goodly part of his manuscript, in consequence of the numerous books on the Gospels which issue yearly from the German press. He felt that by the time he should have finished his observations on the Apocalypse, his manuscript on the Gospels would be partially antiquated. And then the uncertainty of life pressed on his mind. Such were the considerations that determined him to publish the volumes separately, as soon as they could be ready for the press. Each will be complete in itself, as far as it goes; and perhaps some readers may be disposed to purchase one, who do not want any more. The materials of the second volume are already in a good state of forwardness; and it is the Author's purpose to publish it as speedily as possible. Whether the work will be completed in two or in three volumes, he is unable to say; but thinks it likely that it may extend to three.

In the mean time, he desires that the portion of it now issued should obtain a fair and candid hearing. He can truly say, that he has spent much time and thought on its preparation. No available source of information, adapted to render it worthy of the name, "Introduction," has been neglected. It may not be acceptable to those who are averse to thorough inquiry, or scared by the very appearance of learning; or to such as are willing to float unreflectingly along the current of common notions. But he trusts that *the real students* of the Bible will find in it some assistance in their inquiries; and that they will be guided along a safe path by the

aid of its light. If it obtain the approbation of *competent judges*, his time will not have been spent in vain. If it tend to place the foundation of our holy religion in a strong and impregnable aspect, he will be sufficiently rewarded. With heart-felt gratitude to Almighty God, who has assisted him thus far, he sends forth the first volume of a work intended to explain and defend that sacred Book whence his purest consolations are derived.

A complete Index to the whole will be given with the last volume.

LANCASHIRE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE.
August, 1848.

CONTENTS.

DIVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS.

PAGE

The earliest division found in Irenaeus.—The same in Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian.— Cyprian's substantially identical.— Origen's division — That in Pseudo-Athanasius.

THE GOSPELS.

The term εὐαγγέλιον applied only to oral accounts at first. — The first appropriation of it to written accounts, in Justin Martyr. — Justin's words quoted. — The number of the Canonical Gospels always reckoned four. — Speculations of the fathers about the reason of that number — They derived it from the cherubim in Ezekiel — Appropriation of the four writers to the four animals mentioned by the prophet, not uniform. — Jerome's. appropriation prevalent in the West.

GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

I. NOTICES OF THE WRITER. — Matthew and Levi not different persons — Objection to the view that they were identical — Levi not the same with Lebbaeus or Thaddaeus — Few certain particulars of his life recorded — Preached in Arabia Felix after leaving Palestine — Manner of his death not ascertained, nor the place where he died. 1

II. THE PERSONS FOR WHOM THE FIRST GOSPEL WAS CHIEFLY DESIGNED. — Matthew wrote primarily for the use of the Jewish converts — Not for the instruction of the Jewish Christians in Palestine — Authority for believing that he wrote for Hebrew Christians — Internal evidence tending to establish the same thing. 2

III. THE LANGUAGE IN WHICH IT WAS WRITTEN. — Ancient historical evidence unanimous that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Aramaean — Early witnesses in favour of this fact quoted — Papias — Irenaeus — Pantaenus — Origen. — Jerome. — Separate examination of each of the above witnesses. — Reason assigned for weakening Papias' evidence. — Eusebius' statements respecting him. — Papias has specified *the source* whence he derived his information about Matthew. — Hug's attempt to invalidate his testimony, impotent. — He was a credible and competent witness. — Reasons assigned for disposing of Irenaeus' testimony, invalid — Cannot be proved that he followed Papias simply.—Arbitrary attempts to emend Irenaeus' words — True meaning of them. — Pantaenus' testimony independent of Papias. — Eusebius, though giving the account of Pantaenus' going to India as a report, appears to have believed it.— The tradition presupposes the existence of an Aramaean

PAGE

Gospel. -- Hárless' attempt to weaken the force of Eusebius' words concerning Pantaenus ineffectual. — Origen's testimony an expression of the prevailing opinion of the age — No valid considerations for denying its individuality. — Eusebius' opinion cannot be resolved into that of Papias. — The context of the passage in which he speaks of Papias, proves that he believed what he attributes to Papias on this point. — Hug's argument to shew that the historian exhibits a different opinion in another place, founded on an erroneous basis. — Positions deducible from Jerome's writings respecting this topic. — 1. The authentic Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew. — 2. The Gospel according to the Hebrews was used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites. — 3. This Gospel was identical with the Aramaean original of Matthew. — Proof of these positions. — Reasons for believing that Jerome, though conceiving at one time that the Gospel of the Hebrews proceeded from Matthew, changed his opinion subsequently. — Examination of these reasons, and their insufficiency to prove that for which they are adduced. — Probable explanation of Jerome's indefinite expressions on the point. — Positions derivable from Epiphanius' writings — 1. The authentic Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew. — 2. The Gospel according to the Hebrews was used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites. — 3. This Gospel was identical with the Aramaean original of Matthew. — 4. While the Gospel used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites was substantially the same, there were some differences in their recensions of it. — Proof of these positions. — Alleged proofs of the Gospel used by the Nazarenes having been written in Greek — their relevancy turned aside. — All the notices of this Hebrew Gospel contained in the works of the fathers quoted. — What Eusebius relates of Papias concerning a woman accused of many sins. — The historian's notice of Hegesippus. — A passage in Ignatius' epistle to the Smyrnians. — Clement of Alexandria. — Two passages in Origen. — Eusebius, when speaking of the spurious books, and of the Ebionites. — Epiphanius respecting the Ebionites gives various passages. — Passages in Jerome bearing on the point. — General inferences from the preceding accounts of the Aramaean Gospel, that none of the fathers saw and used it except Hegesippus, Clement, Origen, Epiphanius, and Jerome. — Some say that Epiphanius had only a Greek translation of the Ebionite copy, or that he knew it merely by report. — Reasons alleged for this opinion. — Opposite considerations. — The discrepancies existing between the Hebrew Gospel, as known by extant quotations, and the present Greek canonical Gospel, consist of mere additions to the text, or of enlargements of what is stated in the text of the latter. — The passages quoted from the Ebionite copy by Epiphanius, shew that it was Matthew's Gospel curtailed, abridged, and adulterated, as well as enlarged. — Value attached to the Gospel in question by the fathers. — Epiphanius' assertions. — Jerome's expressions. — Those who knew it thought it of some value, but did not regard it as canonical. — The Ebionite document was undervalued by them. — Historical notice of the origin and creed of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, with the view of shewing why the document was not quoted as authoritative or canonical. — True cause of the degree of estimation in which the Nazarene copy was held. — Cause of the low repute of the other recension. — Gospel of the Twelve Apostles. — Probably the same with the Ebionite re-

PAGE

cension. — The question respecting the Hebrew original of Matthew's Gospel independent of that relating to the Gospel of the Hebrews. — Summary review of the account given of the original Gospel of Matthew. — Other arguments in favour of a Hebrew original — viz. 1. The persons for whose use it was written — The tenacity of the Jewish nation in abiding by their language — The case of Josephus writing the history of his countrymen — His writing that history first in Hebrew. — Other circumstances connected with the Jewish historian in favour of the same opinion.—The two passages in the New Testament pertinent to the subject. — Syro-Chaldaic was not extinct in Palestine in the fourth century. — Character of the church in Palestine when Matthew wrote. — The Septuagint version never read by the Jews in their synagogues.—The existence and origin of Targums about the time of Christ, imply that the people were best acquainted with Aramaean. — The chief circumstance in connection with the persons for whom Matthew wrote, favourable to a Syro-Chaldaic Gospel. — Attempts to shew the invalidity of the preceding circumstances as presumptive evidence for a Hebrew original.—Their feebleness shewn in relation to the separate points adduced. — 2. The Hebraisms of the Gospel favourable to its Hebrew original. — 3. The mode of quotation may be urged on the same side of the question. — 4. Another argument adduced by Michaelis founded on the preface of Luke's Gospel. — The author of the Greek translation not Matthew himself. — The interval of time between the composition of the original and the version considerable, and why. — Relation between the Aramaean and the Greek. — Why it was intimate.—The translator made several additions. — These explanatory addenda given. — Virtual inspiration possessed by the writer to whom we owe the present Greek Gospel. — Chief arguments against a Hebrew original.—The old Syriac was made from the Greek, not the Hebrew.— Refutation of this argument. — The canonical Gospel has no characteristics of translation — disproof of this. — Paronomasias in the Greek — an invalid fact. — The Greek alone quoted or referred to by the fathers — not pertinent. — Hypothesis of a double publication of the same Gospel by Matthew in the language — Its untenableness. 3

IV. Characteristic Peculiarities of the Gospel.—Mode of narration. — Chronological succession not observed. — The apostle's mode of grouping together discourses and parables — Neglect of time and place. — The beginning of sections, appealed to by some in favour of the chronological character of the Gospel. — The notices of time quoted for this object do not prove it. — Refutation of an argument adduced by Marsh from Matthew having been an apostle and eye-witness. — Way in which the writer describes events, and constructs his sentences. — Aspects of the Saviour's person presented. — Diction of Matthew Hebraised.—Forty-three characteristics of diction and expression adduced. 52

V. Apostolic Origin or Authenticity. — The present Gospel not immediately and directly authentic, but substantially and truly so.— Reasons for regarding it in this light. — Allusions to it in the apostolic fathers inde-

PAGE

finite — Difficulty in dealing with them — The only early works that can be used in the argument. — A passage from the forty-sixth chapter of Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians — does not prove that Clement had the Greek Gospel. — Another passage in the thirteenth chapter — does not necessarily or probably point to a written source. — A passage in Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians. — Three hypotheses regarding it. — May have been taken from traditional accounts rather than the written Gospel. — Testimony of Papias. — The existence of a Greek Gospel implied in it. — The statement belongs to the presbyter John, rather than to Papias. — In what way Papias' words have been employed against the Gospel's authenticity. — Meaning assigned by various writers to the word λόγια. — Reasons for believing that λόγια means nothing else than the Gospel of Matthew. — Interpretation of the word ἡρμήνευσε. — If Papias were acquainted with the first epistle of John, he must have known the first Gospel. — Basilides acquainted with the Gospel of Matthew. — The Prodicians used it. — So also Valentinus and his followers — Marc — Ptolemy — Heracleon — Celsus. — The Ἀπομνημονεύματα of Justin Martyr now admitted by the ablest critics to be none other than the four Gospels. — Tatian's harmony. — Athenagoras quotes part of Matthew. — So also Theophilus of Antioch — Hegesippus — Theodotus — Irenaeus — Tertullian — Clement of Alexandria — Origen — Jerome. — Impossible to assign the origin of the Greek Gospel to any part of the second century. — The title κατὰ Ματθαῖον indicative of authorship. — Why the *essential* identity of the Greek and the Aramaean original is to be inferred. — Inconsistency of those who impugn the authenticity of the Greek, while maintaining that Matthew wrote in Hebrew. — Internal phenomena said to be unfavourable to the Gospel's authenticity. — Fourteen arguments adduced for this purpose by De Wette and others. — 1. An eye-witness and apostle would not have omitted the ministry of Jesus in Judea. — 2. The arrangement of time is arbitrary, and sometimes erroneous. — 3. Some narratives are unhistorical. — 4. The same transaction is repeated by an oversight. — 5. There is a want of graphic description. — 6. The writer has been led astray by certain prophecies in the Old Testament. — 7. Several of Jesus' discourses are not adduced in their true historical connection. — 8. There is great obscurity respecting the Messianic dignity attributed by Jesus to Himself; and there is a contradiction between the sermon on the mount and xvi. 16. — 9. It is incredible that the same occurrence should have been repeated within so short a time as is done in xv. 29 - 39 and xiv. 13, etc. — 10. The account of Jesus' baptism in the first Gospel, compared with that given in the fourth. — 11. Christ's temptation in the wilderness cannot be historical. — 12. Various circumstances connected with the passage xvii. 24 - 27. — 13. The transaction recorded in xxi. 18 - 22. — 14. Matthew represents Jesus as celebrating the passover on the evening after the fourteenth of Nisan, so that He was crucified on the fifteenth; while John states that He was crucified on the fourteenth of the same month. — Each of these objections examined and refuted. — General remarks on them all together 60

VI. Integrity. — External evidence against the authenticity of the first

PAGE

two chapters.—1. Epiphanius' statement about the commencement of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.—2. Tatian omitted the genealogy in his Harmony. —3. Some Latin MSS. separate the portion containing the genealogy from what follows.—4. Mark's Gospel contains no account of the birth and infancy of Jesus.—Internal arguments against the authenticity.—1. The mode in which the third chapter begins.—2. The genealogy given is irreconcilable with that of Luke.—3. There are striking discrepancies between the accounts of Jesus' nativity in the two chapters and in Luke's Gospel.—4. The story of the Magi a mixture of astrology and miracle.—These separate objections, external and internal, examined and refuted.—Positive arguments in favour of the chapters' authenticity.—They are found in all unmutilated Greek MSS., and in all ancient versions.—The earliest fathers had them in their copies—Ignatius—Hegesippus—Justin Martyr—Irenaeus—Clement of Alexandria. —The early heretics and opponents of Christianity were acquainted with them.—Cerinthus and his followers—Celsus—Porphyry.—The commencement of the third chapter presupposes something antecedent.—So also iii. 13. —The diction of the two chapters bears the same impress and character as the whole Gospel. 111

VII. Time and Place at which the Gospel was written.—The prevailing opinion has always been that it was written first—Clement of Alexandria—Origen—Eusebius—stands first in MSS. and versions.—Four leading opinions as to time.—1. The third year after Christ's ascension.—2. Eight years after the ascension.—3. Fifteen years after the same event. —4. Irenaeus places it after A. D. 60.—Separate examination of these four opinions.—The first untenable.—Reasons alleged for so early a date by Owen and Tomline, and the insufficiency of them as proofs of it.—Examination of the fourth opinion, viz. that of Irenaeus.—Circumstances adduced by Lardner in favour of a late date.—Reasons assigned by some for thinking it was written shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, about A. D. 70.—Their invalidity.—Review of the discordant opinions respecting the time of composition.—Most probable date.—The place where it was written . . 127

VIII. Contents of the Gospel.—The whole divided into six parts.—1. The birth and infancy of Jesus.—2. Circumstances preparatory to his public ministry.—3. His public appearances in Galilee.—4. His journey to Jerusalem and residence there.—5. His passion.—6. Resurrection. . . . 136

GOSPEL OF MARK.

I. The Author.—The author identical with the person called John, and John Mark.—A native of Jerusalem and friend of Barnabas.—Separation from Paul, and subsequent reconciliation to him.—Nothing certain known about the latter part of his life.—The accounts of the fathers regarding it.—The young man mentioned in xiv. 51, 52 probably Mark himself.—Little indication in the New Testament of Mark's connection with Peter.—Supposed by some that the Mark mentioned in 1 Peter v. 13 was identical with the evangelist.—Reasons alleged for believing that person to be Peter's son.

PAGE

— This improbable. — No good objection to the view that the person spoken of by Peter was the evangelist. — The voice of tradition affirms Mark's close connection with Peter. — Papias or John the presbyter — Irenaeus — Clement of Alexandria — Tertullian — Origen — Eusebius — Jérome. — Meaning of the expression *interpreter* of Peter applied to Mark. — Internal indications of the writer's connection with Peter. — Passages apparently unfavourable to the hypothesis. — Mode of explaining them so as not to infringe on the truth of the hypothesis. 138

II. Persons for whom Mark wrote. — The Gospel intended for Gentile believers in the first instance.—Localities in Palestine as well as Jewish usages and rites explained. — Things that might give offence to the Gentiles, or that would be important to the Jews alone, omitted. — Opinion that it was meant for Roman Christians in particular. — Various expressions adduced for this purpose. — Not valid proofs. — Mark's object in writing not a specific one. — He intended to enlighten Gentile converts in the leading facts of Jesus' life on earth. 147

III. Characteristics. — Mode of narration — presents graphic and lively descriptions — Characterised by precision. — Thirteen peculiarities of diction specified. — The language not pure or elegant. — Awkward expressions and modes of construction 150

IV. Original Language of the Gospel. — Supposed by some that because it was written at Rome it was composed in Latin. — Discovery of the pretended Latin original. — Illogical to conclude that it was written in Latin. — No reason for denying its Greek original. — Singular hypothesis that it was written in Ethiopic 154

V. Authenticity. —Papias' or John the presbyter's statement.—Supposed inapplicability to the present Gospel. — Its certainty not to be assumed. — Different modes of explaining the term τάξις. —Credner's interpretation — Refutation of it. — Tholuck's interpretation of it — its improbability. — Ebrard's and Reuss's explanations — incorrectness of them. — Meyer's assumption untenable.—The expression οὐ τάξει does not agree with the present Gospel.—Hypothesis that a succeeding writer, taking the imperfect work of Mark as the basis, composed the second Gospel. — Baur's objection to this. — Papias or John the presbyter mistaken in his opinion. — Few express quotations from the Gospel in the early fathers, and why. — Testimony of Irenaeus — Justin Martyr. —Tatian's evidence. — Valentinus and his followers — Celsus — Ptolemy 155

VI. Relation of the Gospel to Peter. — Testimony of early writers, as to whether it was written before or after Peter's death, when the apostle was with the writer or when he was absent, whether the apostle sanctioned it by his authority, inconsistent and unsatisfactory. — John the presbyter's language. — Irenaeus'. — That of Clement of Alexandria. — Of Eusebius —

PAGE

Jerome — Origen. — Probable that Peter was not with Mark when the latter undertook to write. — Reasons for supposing that the Gospel was ultimately based on apostolic authority. 160

VII. TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING. — Two extremes to be avoided, that it was written first, and that it appeared last of all the Gospels. — Some place it A. D. 40. — Others about A. D. 43. — The ancient testimonies of Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria contradictory. — Feilmoser's mode of reconciling them, untenable. — The testimony of Irenaeus places the composition after Peter's death — The date most nearly A. D. 64. — Supposed indications of date in the Gospel itself. — The place of its origin, Rome or Alexandria. — Ancient testimony in favour of the former. — The Latinisms do not prove that the Gospel was written at Rome. — The hypothesis of two editions improbable. 162

VIII. INTEGRITY. — The last eleven verses of the Gospel suspected. — External arguments against their authenticity, with the opposite considerations in favour of the paragraph. — Six internal considerations against authenticity. — Judgment pronounced against the paragraph. — Perhaps Mark's death was the cause of the abrupt termination. — Hypothesis that the evangelist himself added the section at another time. — More probable that it proceeded from another person, who used the Gospels of Luke and John. — No reason for rejecting, with Reuss, the first thirteen verses of the Gospel. 164

IX. CONTENTS. — The Gospel divided into three parts. — 1. Transactions preparatory to the public ministry of Christ. — 2. His ministry in Galilee. — 3. His last journey to Jerusalem, with the events which transpired in the city. — The order of events nearer Luke's than Matthew's. 172

GOSPEL OF LUKE.

I. THE AUTHOR. — Luke, *the beloved physician*, probably the same as the evangelist. — No certain indications in the Gospel and Acts, of the writer's profession. — Lardner's reasons for thinking that Luke had been a Jew, not valid. — Probably of Gentile origin, from Col. iv. 11, 14. — Not certain that he was a manumitted slave. — Nothing certain known of his native place. — Probably an inhabitant of a Greek city. — Circumstances of his life contained in the Acts. — Uncertainty of the patristic accounts respecting the latter part of his life. 174

II. PREFACE OF THE GOSPEL. — What we learn from it — 1. That many previous attempts had been made to give a fixed character to the evangelical tradition — the nature of these attempts. — 2. The qualifications he possessed for writing a Gospel. — 3. The mode in which he professes to write it — not exactly chronological, as some suppose. — 4. His predecessors had failed in their endeavours to write gospels. — Reasons for believing that neither Matthew nor Mark is included in the *many*. — 5. The relation of Luke's Gospel to the works of the many. — The latter probably used by Luke.

PAGE

— He availed himself of eye and ear-witnesses.—6. Luke himself not an eye-witness, nor one of the seventy disciples 176

III. Relation of Luke's Gospel to Paul. — Quotations from the fathers, in which Luke's Gospel is virtually resolved into the authority of the apostle Paul. — Irenaeus — Tertullian — Origen — Eusebius — Jerome — Pseudo-Athanasius. — Alleged indications of the truth of the tradition in the Gospel itself. — Baselessness of the tradition 180

IV. For whom the Gospel was written at first. — Written for the instruction of Theophilus. — Various conjectures respecting Theophilus. — He was a Gentile believer. — The general purpose of the Gospel. — Its adaptation to Gentiles.— Many of its explanations unnecessary for Jews. — Things which would have been uninteresting to Gentiles omitted. — Theophilus not an imaginary person. — Import of the epithet κράτιστος. — Localities assigned to Theophilus — he lived in Italy — reason for this opinion — Not certain — Only certain that he was a Gentile Christian living out of Palestine . . 185

V. Characteristics.— Circumstantiality, exactness, and graphic power.— Examples of pictorial power. — In what respect Luke's Gospel is inferior to Matthew's.— Indefinite expressions employed in linking his narratives together. — The Gospel bears the marks of an inquirer — Its diction — Purer and less Hebraised than that of the other evangelists. — The diction of the proem — Why purer than that of the Gospel itself. — Sixty-four peculiarities of diction enumerated, as collected from the Gospel and the Acts. — A few examples of comparison between the diction of Luke and that of Matthew and Mark. — Difference between the style of the Gospel and of the Acts — Between the two parts of the Acts — Reason of it. 188

VI. Time and Place. — Nine places mentioned where it was written. — Reasons for at once rejecting most of them — Most probable that it was composed at Rome. — Reasons alleged for supposing that it was written after the destruction of Jerusalem — Refutation of them.— The twenty-first chapter shews that Luke wrote prior to that catastrophe. — Time of its composition compared with those of Matthew and Mark. — Luke wrote prior to Mark. . 199

VII. Authenticity. — Supposed testimony in 1 Tim. v. 18. — its doubtfulness. — Marcion's evidence. — This heretic's Gospel was Luke's abridged and mutilated. — Views of the Tübingen school, particularly of Ritschl on this point. — Testimony of Cerdo. — Papias' language not explicit. — Justin Martyr. — Celsus. — Tatian. — Valentinus and his disciples. — The Marcosians. — Theodotus. — Heracleon. — Epistle of Vienne and Lyons. — Objections adduced by Credner against the authenticity. — Luke ii. 1, 2, four points urged from this passage by way of objection. — Examination and refutation of these particulars. — iii. 1, objection founded on this passage. — All the notices bearing on Lysanias collected from Josephus and Dio Cassius, and arranged in chronological succession. — Reasons for supposing

PAGE

that a younger Lysanias, identical with the Lysanias of Luke, is meant in the places of Josephus relating to the times of Caligula and Claudius. — Paulus' conjectures. — Four observations on the passage by way of conclusion. — Objection to authenticity from iii. 23, compared with ii. 1, nugatory. — Alleged myths and traditional sayings inserted in the first two chapters. — Alleged contradictions between Matthew and Luke. 202

VIII. INTEGRITY. — Objections to the first two chapters. — External evidence *against* overbalanced by that *for* their genuineness. — Internal evidence against, as given by Norton — Refutation of it. 221

IX. CONTENTS. — The Gospel divided into five parts. — 1. Birth and childhood of John the Baptist and of Jesus. — 2. Circumstances preparatory to Christ's public ministry. — 3. His appearances in Galilee as the Messiah. — 4. Discourses and events in Galilee, and on His last journey to Jerusalem, with His triumphal entry into the city. — 5. History of His apprehension, crucifixion, death, resurrection, and ascension. 224

GOSPEL OF JOHN.

I. NOTICES OF THE WRITER. — John younger than James. — Facts evincing that his parents were in easy circumstances. — Instructions of Salome, and their effect on his mind. — First acquaintance with Jesus. — His proper call to be a follower. — Honoured with his Master's peculiar affection. — After the ascension returned to his former occupation. — Subsequent notices in the New Testament. — Traditions respecting the time of his leaving the metropolis finally. — The latter part of his life spent in Asia Minor. — Probability that he did not reside there till after Paul's death. — Came to Asia Minor after A. D. 64. — He survived all the apostles. — Various accounts of his age, and the manner of his death. — Was unmarried. — Banishment to Patmos. — Diversity of opinion respecting the time of the exile, and the emperor by whom he was banished. — Testimonies on this point of Clemens Alex., Origen, Tertullian, Irenaeus, Jerome, Epiphanius, the Syriac version, Dorotheus, Eusebius, etc. — Suspicious circumstances about the tradition — All that is certain in it. — The abode in Patmos not a fiction 225

II. TIME AND PLACE AT WHICH THE GOSPEL WAS WRITTEN. — Arguments of those who think it was composed before the destruction of Jerusalem. — Their inconclusiveness. — Opinion that it was written about the close of the first century. — Considerations favourable to it. — Value of the fathers' testimony respecting time. — Irenaeus' testimony respecting place. — Different opinions 230

III. AUTHENTICITY. — Most ancient testimony contained in xxi. 24, 25. — The next in 1 Peter i. 14. — Ignatius, two passages from. — Polycarp — Papias. — Epistle to Diognetus. — Polycrates — Justin Martyr. — Difficulties connected with the allusions of this writer. — Tatian's harmony. — His oration against the Gentiles. — Apollinaris, two fragments. — Athenagoras.

PAGE

— Epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons. — Valentinians. — Uncertain about Valentinus himself. — Heracleon — Ptolemy — Simon Magus — Celsus — Theophilus of Antioch. — Irenaeus, importance of his testimony. —Tertullian. — Fragment on the canon in Muratori. — The old Syriac version. — The Alexandrian church, viz. Clement, Origen, and Dionysius. — Eusebius. — Lützelberger's attack on the Gospel's authenticity. — Summary of his argumentation to prove that the current tradition respecting John's abode in Asia Minor is without foundation. — Examination of the various links in the argumentation, and refutation of them. —General remarks on the objections advanced against the Gospel from external sources. — Observations on the nature of the writings attributed to the apostolic fathers in relation to the present question. — Probability that these fathers knew the Gospel. — Objections to Ignatius' acquaintance with the Gospel, repelled. — Attempts to shew that Polycarp did not know it. — Their futility. — Papias' testimony unshaken by the cavils of various writers. — Objections to Justin Martyr's testimony — Their frivolousness. — The testimony of the Valentinians not capable of being invalidated. — Difficulty of shewing that Marcion was acquainted with John's Gospel. — Two suppositions possible relative to his knowledge of it. — Considerations urged in favour of the hypothesis that he was ignorant of the Gospel's existence. — Circumstances favourable to the view that he rejected the Gospel. — Irenaeus and Tertullian credible witnesses for this. — Tertullian's testimony favourable to it. — The disciples of Marcion acquainted with the Gospel. — Passage in Irenaeus relating to the Alogi. — Epiphanius' statement respecting the sect. — The Alogi rejected the Gospel from doctrinal motives. — Nature of the attempts made to invalidate Irenaeus' testimony — Their futility demonstrated. — Porphyry and Julian acknowledged the authenticity. — Faustus' rejection of the Gospel. — His opinion of no weight. — General observations on the impotency of the attacks recently made on the Gospel's authenticity. — All the probabilities in favour of the established opinion. — Objections arising from internal phenomena in the Gospel — 1. The high degree of culture exhibited in the document, alleged to be inconsistent with the mental character of the person named John. — 2. A want of definiteness, accuracy, and vividness, with geographical and archaeological mistakes, besides the insertion of traditional reminiscences in improper places. — 3. Diversity between this Gospel and the other three, in regard to the scene and duration of Jesus' public ministry, the nature of his person, the discourses he uttered. — Certain facts and phenomena to be observed, before entering on an examination of these objections — the habitudes and intimacies of the apostle — the time at which he wrote — the object he had in view — the circumstances by which he was surrounded — the agreement between the synoptists and John — practical aspects of the Gospel. — The promise contained in xiv. 26, and its bearing on John recording lengthened discourses of the Redeemer. — Separate examination of the classes of objections already stated. — Under No. 1. the Logos-doctrine of John. — That doctrine not derived from Philo or the Alexandrian school — Traceable to the most ancient books of the Old Testament. — Philo's view of the Logos different from John's. — The Palestinian type of the Logos-doctrine pre-

PAGE

sented in the Gospel — Not the result of the later development of a post-apostolic period. — The Christology of John identical in its main features with that of Paul. — John not an obstinate Jewish-Christian apostle. — His views not opposed to Paul's. — No discrepancy between Gal. ii. 7 - 12 and John xii. 20, etc. — The culture of mind observable in the writer accounted for on the hypothesis of the apostolic authorship. — Under No. 2 alleged vagueness. — The expression *the Jews*. — Alleged foreignness of the relation borne by the writer and by Jesus himself to the Jewish people. — Obscure representation of events. — Geographical and archaeological difficulties. — Traditional reminiscences inserted in improper places. — Inference drawn from this group of objections by the negative critics. — These separate particulars examined, and shewn to be irrelevant, incorrect, or invalid. — Under No. 3, diversities between the fourth Gospel and the first three. — The scene and duration of Jesus' ministry different. — The Passover-journeys and the ministry of Christ in Judea with which they are connected, pronounced unhistorical. — Reasons for believing that the different Passover-journeys were not fabricated by the writer of the fourth Gospel. — No contradiction between the Synoptists and John in this respect. — The latter's descriptions more natural. — Passages in the Synoptists themselves intimating that His ministry was not confined to Galilee. — Reason why the Synoptists speak only of Jesus' last journey to keep the Passover. — Internal evidence strongly corroborates the correctness of John's account. — Diversity regarding Jesus' person, urged as an objection. — Compatibility of the portraits drawn by the Synoptists and by John — Their substantial likeness — Both must be combined to obtain a comprehensive view of the Redeemer's person. — Analogous example in the character of Socrates, as drawn by Plato and Xenophon. — Reason why John presents such aspects of the Saviour as his Gospel contains. — Objection derived from the discourses of Jesus — said to be moulded both in matter and form by the writer's subjective ideas — alleged to disagree with the laws of verisimilitude and memory. — Undue concessions made on this point by Lücke and Neander. — Various particulars stated which constitute an answer to the objection. — 1. The evangelist has separated between expressions uttered by Christ, and the sense he attaches to them. — 2. The prophetic declarations of Jesus, which relate particularly to his sufferings, death, and resurrection, favour the view of John's accuracy. — 3. The title λόγος or θεός never put into the mouth of Jesus himself. — Baur's attempt to invalidate this last particular. — Its pointlessness. — Examination of the assertion that the evangelist has given his own style to John the Baptist, and that he is even largely responsible for the matter of the latter's language. — The two passages on which this charge is founded examined. — The writer also said to be responsible for the matter of a discourse attributed to Jesus, iii. 16 - 21. — The passage reviewed, and the objection derived from it rebutted. — Alleged want of parables in John as compared with the synoptists, another objection against the former — mode of accounting for this peculiarity. — Condensation of various considerations already stated in favour of the Gospel's authenticity, with additional arguments. — 1. The writer terms himself an immediate disciple of the Lord, and an eye-witness. — Improbability that an unknown

PAGE

writer adopted this style, because he wished to be regarded as the apostle John. — 2. The manner in which John the Baptist is mentioned. — 3. The mode in which the writer marks the ideas entertained by the disciples of Jesus' words and deeds. — 4. Internal evidence proves the author to have been a Jew. — 5. Several peculiarities in the Gospel point to an eye-witness. — 6. The concluding clause of xiv. 31 favours the authenticity. — Concluding remarks on the authenticity of the Gospel. — Baumgarten-Crusius' opinion 233

IV. The immediate Occasion and Object. — Tradition preserved in a fragment of Clemens Alexandrinus and elsewhere — The tradition substantially correct. — Probable allusions to the persons who requested John to write the Gospel, in the Gospel itself. — Object of the apostle as stated by himself. — Selection and arrangement of the materials in conformity with this general object — Consideration of the subordinate scope. — Different opinions regarding it — Some suppose it was polemic — against the Ebionites — the Gnostics, Docetae, Nicolaitans — against the Zabians. — Examination of these respective hypotheses — their untenableness shewn. — No good evidence in the Gospel that the writer's object was polemic. — Opinion that the Gospel was written with the view of supplying what is wanting in the other three. — Ancient writers in whom this view is found — Eusebius — Theodore of Mopsuestia — Jerome. — Considerations adverse to the hypothesis. — 1. John has much in common with the Synoptists. — 2. Probable that he would have stated it somewhere. — 3. The great discrepancy between some of his narratives and theirs, unfavourable to it. — 4. Internal evidence against it. — 5. Probable that several indefinite or obscure things would have been retouched and illustrated by John. — 6. Improbable that the written Gospels were circulated in the place where John wrote at that time. — In what way the apostle had a subordinate design in writing. — His subjective views were affected and moulded by the various phenomena around him. — Attempt to ascertain the surrounding influences amid which the apostle lived when he wrote the Gospel. — Elements of Jewish gnosis. — Christian gnosis developed out of Judaism — Cerinthus representative of the latter. — Gnosis as manifested in the Docetic tendency. — Doubts and difficulties in the region of Christianity. — Longings after a higher doctrine. — Influence of the Pauline epistles which were known to the Ephesian Christians. — Points of difficulty which John had to meet. — Cravings after greater satisfaction which he had to fill up. — Prologue of the Gospel. — Character of the work *apologetic*, not *polemic*. — Precise amount of truth embodied in the views of those who think that John intended to combat Ebionitism, Gnosticism, and Docetism respectively. — Amount of truth involved in the supplementary hypothesis. — Importance of not attributing to the writer any object more specific than he has warranted us himself. — Mode in which the Tübingen school use this alleged specificness. . . 313

V. Characteristics. — Position occupied by the writer, and point of view from which he surveys the evangelical history. — Plan — not very definite or systematic. — The work divided into two parts, i. 19—xii, and xiii—xx. — Their respective aspects and contents. — The first subdivided into two portions.

PAGE

— The second also similarly subdivided. — The transition between the two latter subdivisions not definitely marked. — The prologue consists of the first eighteen verses. — Its true relation to the Gospel. — the Jewish festivals marked by the writer. — Chronology a minor consideration. — Mode of narration. — The Gospel characterised by simplicity, vividness, and life. — Its naturalness and tenderness. — Erroneous view of what is termed *the mysticism* of John. — What is properly meant by the mysticism of the apostle, and how it is accounted for. — Style and diction. — The Gospel not written in Aramaean at first. — Style marked by softness, ease, and simplicity. — Mode in which sentences and verses are connected. — Stock of words not copious, but appropriate to the ideas. — Seventy-seven peculiarities of diction enumerated, as collected from the Gospel and the first epistle 334

VI. COMPARISON OF THE CONTENTS WITH THOSE OF THE SYNOPTISTS. — Similarity. — Particulars related both by John and the Synoptists. — John's agreement with the latter seldom verbal. — He approaches more nearly to Matthew than Mark or Luke. — The diversity between cognate paragraphs in John and the Synoptists affects both the form and the substance. — In what places it is greatest. — Peculiar character of the diversity in form. — New matter introduced. — Two-thirds of the Gospel new. 346

VII. INTEGRITY. — Suspected parts of the Gospel. — The last two verses of the twenty-first chapter. — Internal evidence against their authenticity. — Little external evidence against them. — The internal alone justifies a denial of the authenticity. — Reasoning of Lücke to shew that the two verses are inseparable from the rest of the chapter — Its conclusiveness questioned. — The first half of the twenty-fourth verse genuine. — Five considerations urged by Lücke for rejecting the whole chapter — a particular reply to, and refutation of each. — The real difficulties of the chapter insufficient to overthrow its authenticity — Written by John after the Gospel. — The silence of Irenaeus respecting the chapter unimportant. — Authenticity of vii. 53 — viii. 11. — External arguments in favour of it — External authorities against. — The silence of Cyprian and Tertullian about it very suspicious. — Granville Penn's argument from a passage in Tertullian De Pudicitia. — Augustine's alleged mode of accounting for the paragraph's omission in copies — Does not say that it was really ejected from the Greek MSS. for the reason he assigns — cannot be shewn that doctrinal reasons led to its exclusion. — Improbability that the same reason operated equally among Greeks and Latins. — The only circumstance favourable to Augustine's conjecture. — Matthaei's reasoning about Chrysostom. — The Greek church had not the passage in their MSS. before the fifth century — nor the Latin church before the fourth. — Three readings of it — That in D the oldest. — External considerations adverse, on the whole, to authenticity. — Internal evidence. — Diction and manner unlike John. — Great difficulties in the interpretation of it — these difficulties specified. — 1. Difficult to decide in what capacity the Scribes and Pharisees acted — Tholuck's reply. — 2. Difficulty from the kind of punishment mentioned as compared with the Rabbinical interpretation of the law. —

PAGE

Michaelis' attempt to remove this difficulty — not successful. — Hypothesis of Grotius uncertain. — Solution of Selden, Lightfoot, etc., unsatisfactory — that proposed by Ebrard and adopted by Tholuck, insufficient. — 3. Difficulty in supposing what adequate reason there could have been for bringing the case before Jesus. — Various solutions proposed — that of Michaelis — of Grotius — Schulthess — Stäudlin and Hug — Dieck — Augustine — Euthymius. — Conjecture of Michaelis. — Remarks on these various solutions — none of them satisfactory. — A way proposed of obviating the difficulty in part. — The connection of the passage strengthens suspicion against it. — Different modes of elucidating the connection. — Schulthess' method, artificial. — Bruno Bauer's. — The story interrupts the connection. — Internal evidence on the whole against the authenticity. — Useless to inquire after the writer of the paragraph. — Hitzig assigns it to Mark — Schulz to Luke. — Truthfulness of the story. — Derived from early evangelical tradition. — Alleged source of it in the Gospel of the Hebrews. — Strauss' opinion. — Suspiciousness of John v. 3, 4. — Of ἐκδεχομένων . . κίνησιν. — Of ἄγγελος ... νοσήματι. — Authorities against these readings. — Authorities in favour of all the words. — Internal evidence for and against. — The words on the whole very doubtful. — Schweizer's mode of impugning the Gospel's integrity. — His hypothesis untenable — refuted by Grimm 348

CORRESPONDENCES OF THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS.

An exhibition of the passages in which the coincidences of the first three Gospels appear. — Parallels in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. — Parallels in Matthew and Mark. — In Mark and Luke — In Matthew and Luke — These tables appear differently, as given by different critics. — Although the matter of the Gospels is the same, there is great diversity in the arrangement of it. — None of the writers followed exactly chronological order. — Incorrect to speak of *misarrangements* in the Gospels. — Passages shewing the verbal coincidences of the Gospels. — In Matthew, Mark, and Luke. — The verbal coincidences between two Gospels more frequent and striking — In Matthew and Mark — In Mark and Luke — In Matthew and Luke. — Phenomena pointed out by Marsh. — One phenomenon in which he appears to have been mistaken — Another which escaped his notice. — Various hypotheses to account for the correspondences. — 1. That they were derived from a common written source or sources. — 2. That the earlier Gospels were consulted in the composition of the later. — 3. That they were derived from oral tradition. — 4. A combination of the last two opinions. — Discussion of No. 1. — Various writers by whom it was indicated. — Eichhorn first drew general attention to it. — Mode in which he proposed it in the fifth volume of his Universal Library of Biblical Literature. — Marsh's elaboration of the hypothesis. — Eichhorn's new and improved scheme. — Approved by various writers, but modified by Gratz — Form in which Gratz advocated it. — Difference between the views of Eichhorn, Marsh, and Gratz. — Objections against the hypothesis generally. — 1. Unknown in antiquity. — 2. The meagreness and brevity of the original Gospel a barrier to its general reception. — 3. The object for which it was written inconceivable and inexplicable. — 4. The hypothesis is complex and artificial.

PAGE

—5. The preface of Luke's Gospel adverse to it. — 6. All the phenomena not satisfactorily explained by it. — That form of the hypothesis which assumes the existence of several independent Gospels. — Inadequate to the solution of the phenomena. — Hypothesis that one writer made use of the preceding. — Six possible cases of the supplementary hypothesis. — An examination of it in its most plausible forms. — 1. That Mark made use of Matthew alone. — 2. That he made use of Matthew and Luke. — 3. That Luke copied from Mark. — 4. That he copied from Matthew and Mark. — A particular discussion of each of the above-mentioned opinions, with references to the arguments of their ablest advocates. — General remarks on the supplementary hypothesis. — Parallel passages presented to the eye for the purpose of shewing its improbability. — Oral tradition as the source of the first three Gospels — Herder's view — Eckermann's — Paulus' — Sartorius' — Kaiser's — Schleiermacher's. —Gieseler its ablest advocate. — Modified by later writers — contains much truth. — Combination of the traditionary hypothesis with the supplementary. — Advocates of this complex view. — Slight diversities of opinion among them. — Proposed explanation of the correspondences in the first three Gospels. — The original oral Aramaean Gospel. — Circumstances which led to a change in the language. — The circumstances that led to a Greek oral Gospel not conventional and artificial. — Attempt to ascertain the circumstances which led spontaneously and naturally to the formation of a Gospel. — With all its uniformity, the oral tradition not wholly fixed. — Apparent exceptions to the opinion proposed. — Explanation of them consistently with it. — The circumstances detailed insufficient to account for *all* the remarkable coincidences. —Two objections adduced by De Wette. — 1. The traditional hypothesis does not account for the coincidence of parallel statements which extend even to individual terms of rare occurrence. — 2. The entire plan and compass of the synoptical Gospels cannot be so explained. — A third objection by the English translator of Schleiermacher. — The first objection unanswerable, except on the supposition that the Greek translator of Matthew used the Gospels of Mark and Luke. — This additional fact to the traditionary hypothesis, assumed. — Answer to the second objection. — Attempt to take off the edge of the third. — Abuse of the traditionary hypothesis by Strauss and others. — The negative critics undervalue historical evidence in extending the traditionary period into the second century. — Less than twenty years must be assigned to the traditionary period as far as the Hebrew Matthew is concerned, and thirty as regards the Gospels of Mark and Luke. — The former too brief for the mythic hypothesis. — The latter not sufficiently extended. — Reasons why the latter is insufficient. — Probabilities against mythic agencies so early. — Even De Wette's more moderate view of mythic agency improbable. — The promise recorded in John xiv. 26 of great importance, though overlooked by the Germans generally. — Its legitimate bearing on the apostles as writers. — Recent attempt in England to overthrow the mythic hypothesis of Strauss. — Statement of its nature. — Five considerations advanced to shew its baselessness. — Contrary to all the phenomena connected with the Gospels 373

NOTES.

Note I. PAGE

On John the presbyter, and Papias' teacher 425

Note II.

Minute examination of a passage in Josephus, shewing that so far from favouring Diodati's view that Matthew wrote in Greek, it has an opposite bearing 428

Note III.

On the Peshito in reference to the argument derived from it against the Aramaean original of the first Gospel 428

Note IV.

Fritzsche's view of the expression, "Mark, *Peter's interpreter*" . . . 429

INTRODUCTION

TO

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

DIVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS.

THE earliest division of the books of the New Testament is found in Irenaeus, who speaks of the *Εὐαγγέλιον* and *Ἀπόστολος*; the former containing the four Gospels, the latter the remaining books. This distinction also appears in Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian; and is substantially the same with Cyprian's, who speaks of *the Gospels* and *Epistles of the Apostles.* Origen, however, makes another division, less general, and therefore more accurate; viz., the Gospels, Apostles, and the Apocalypse. The author of the Synopsis Sacrae Scripturae attached to Athanasius' works, speaks of eight volumes or parts; 1-4. the Four Gospels; 5. the Acts of the Apostles; 6. the Seven Catholic Epistles; 7. the Fourteen Epistles of Paul; and 8. the Revelation of St. John. The most approved arrangement in modern times is based *on the form* of the writings; agreeably to which they are divided into three classes; viz., *the historical*, embracing the Gospels and Acts; *the doctrinal*, or *epistolary;* and *the prophetic*, containing the Apocalypse only.

THE GOSPELS.

The term *εὐαγγέλιον* prefixed as a title to each of the four books that announces the glad tidings of Messiah's advent, is applied in the New Testament only to things described *orally.* It was not appropriated to *written* documents embodying those

oral accounts till a later than the apostolic period. The first application of it to *the written accounts,* or in other words to our present written Gospels, is found in Justin Martyr, whence we learn that it had come into use in this sense as early as the year of our Lord 150. The words of Justin are too important not to be quoted: *οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι, κ. τ. λ.*[a] "For the apostles, in the memoirs composed by them which are called Gospels, have thus delivered it," etc.

In regard to *the number* of the Gospels received as authentic and authoritative by the early church, it was always stated to be *four.* The four Gospels which have been preserved as sacred to the present time were likewise esteemed sacred by the Christians of the second century. They were carefully separated from similar productions, and placed on a basis immeasurably higher.

It is useless to speculate about the reason of our having neither more nor fewer than four Gospels. The fathers, by the help of allegorical interpretation, discovered an intimation of the fourfold history of Jesus in the four cherubim described by Ezekiel (i. 10). We meet with the fanciful analogy in question so early as Irenaeus, from whom it passed into the writings of Theophylact, and into the scholia of some Moscow MSS. But in comparing the sacred evangelists with the different animals mentioned by the prophet, the writers differed from one another, as is apparent from Irenaeus, Athanasius, Augustine, Jerome, and later authors. In the West the explanation of Jerome came to be the prevalent one; and therefore it is adopted in this country[b].

[a] Apolog. p. 98, ed. Colon.

[b] See Suicer's Thesaurus Ecclesiast. vol. i. p. 1234, et seqq. Credner's Einleit. § 34.

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

In treating of the Gospel according to Matthew, we shall consider the following topics:—

I. Some Notices of the Writer.
II. The Persons for whose use it was designed in the first instance.
III. The Language in which it was written.
IV. Its Characteristic Peculiarities.
V. Apostolic Origin or Authenticity.
VI. Integrity.
VII. Time and Place of Composition.
VIII. Contents.

I. Some notices of the Writer.

Although several critics, both ancient and modern, have supposed that Matthew and Levi were different persons, the probability is much greater that both names belong to one and the same person; the earlier having been *Levi*, the later, *Matthew*. The circumstances related by Mark (ii. 14) and Luke (v. 27) respecting the call of Levi, are so similar to those connected with the call of Matthew (ix. 9), that there can be little doubt of their identity. After embracing Christianity, and entirely changing his mode of life, the apostle seems to have laid aside his former name, and assumed that of Matthew. The only objection to this view worth notice is, that whereas Mark and Luke speak of the call of *Levi*, they afterwards give the name *Matthew* only, in their lists of the apostles, without hinting that the Levi already mentioned was identical with

Matthew, one of the Twelve. It is easy to account for the fact that Matthew himself, having long since laid aside the name of Levi, and not desiring to recall to the recollection of the Jews an employment which they disliked, used no other appellation than that of *Matthew*. Mark and Luke, with greater minuteness, mention that he had been called *Levi;* but, when afterwards giving a catalogue of the apostles, they reckoned it unnecessary to add an explanatory remark, for the purpose of identifying Matthew with Levi, because the appellation *Levi* was then all but obsolete. Thus, there is no ground for assuming, with Sieffert[a] and Strauss[b], that the Greek writer of the first Gospel applied by mistake to Matthew what belonged to a publican named Levi. Equally unfounded is the conjecture, that Levi was the same with the apostle Lebbaeus or Thaddaeus.

Matthew, the son of Alphaeus, and a native of Galilee, was called from his employment of publican at Capernaum, to follow Christ. Few particulars of his life are recorded, on which reliance can be placed.

It is generally related that he left Palestine to preach the Gospel in other countries. It seems most probable that he preached in Arabia Felix, part of which was called Æthiopia, and where there were many Jews. His ascetic mode of life, noticed by Clement of Alexandria[c], rests on an apocryphal basis; while the accounts of his death are also uncertain. On the authority of Heracleon, we may conclude that he died a natural death[d], but whether in Æthiopia, as Socrates affirms[e], or in Macedonia, according to Isidore of Spain[f], it is now impossible to ascertain. Less probable is the statement of Nicephorus, that he suffered martyrdom[g]. Antiquity is agreed in assigning the composition of a Gospel to him.

II. The persons for whom this Gospel was chiefly designed.

It was universally believed in ancient times, that the Gospel of Matthew was primarily intended for the use of Jewish converts.

[a] See his Abhandlung über den Ursprung des ersten kanonischen Evangeliums, p. 54, et seqq.

[b] See Das Leben Jesu, vierte Auflage, vol. i. p. 568, et seqq.

[c] Paedagogus, lib. ii. cap. 1. [d] Ap. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 4.

[e] Hist. Eccles. i. 19. [f] De vita et morte sanct. c. 67. [g] Hist. Eccl. ii. 41.

Here it is not necessary to affirm, as some have done, that he wrote for the instruction of Jewish Christians in Palestine alone. Neither will it be expedient to adduce the testimonies of the fathers to the effect, that Matthew wrote for the use of Hebrew Christians. The fact is affirmed by Irenaeus, Eusebius, Jerome, Theophylact, and others, in the most unequivocal manner. The internal evidence furnished by the Gospel itself agrees with the external witnesses. The writer presupposes an acquaintance, on the part of his readers, with Judea, its geography, natural productions, and local peculiarities, which could only have been expected of Jews. The persons addressed must have had the temple before their eyes, with its sacrifices and offerings. They were familiar with the customs and phraseology of the Hebrews. They are supposed to know the Mosaic law, and all things connected with it. The genealogy of Jesus is traced no farther back than Abraham. In short, the great object of the apostle was to prove to Jewish readers, that the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament received their accomplishment in Jesus of Nazareth; to demonstrate that Jesus had shewn himself by his doctrine and deeds to be the seed of David, the Messiah long expected by the Jewish nation. The entire plan and contents of the Gospel, especially the quotations introduced from the Old Testament, and their introductory formulas, furnish ample confirmation of the truth of these remarks[h].

III. The language in which it was written.

On this subject, ancient historical testimony is unanimous in declaring that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, i.e. in the Aramaean or Syro-Chaldaic language, at that time the vernacular tongue of the Jews in Palestine. Let us examine the various links composing this chain of evidence.

The earliest witness is Papias, who lived very near the time of the apostles, and is styled by Irenaeus "a hearer of John, and a companion of Polycarp." Here it is uncertain whether John the apostle, or John the presbyter, was intended[i]. In a work, entitled *Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξήγησις*, "An Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord," of which some fragments are preserved by Irenaeus,

[h] See Townson's Discourses on the Four Gospels, iv. 5.
[i] See note I at the end of this volume.

Eusebius, Maximus Confessor, and others, we find the following: —*Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος*[k]. "Matthew wrote the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, and every one interpreted them as he was able."

Irenaeus writes[l]:—*Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, κ. τ. λ.* "Matthew, among the Jews, did also publish a Gospel in writing, in their own language."

Speaking of Pantaenus, Eusebius writes[m]:—*Ὁ Πάνταινος καὶ εἰς Ἰνδοὺς ἐλθεῖν λέγεται· Ἔνθα λόγος εὑρεῖν αὐτὸν προφθάσαν τὴν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον παρά τισιν αὐτόθι τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπεγνωκόσιν· οἷς Βαρθολομαῖον τῶν ἀποστόλων ἕνα κηρύξαι, αὐτοῖς τε Ἑβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλεῖψαι γραφὴν, ἣν καὶ σώζεσθαι εἰς τὸν δηλούμενον χρόνον.* "Pantaenus is also said to have gone to the Indians, where it is reported he found the Gospel of Matthew, which had been delivered to some in that country who had the knowledge of Christ before his arrival: to whom Bartholomew, one of the apostles, is said to have preached, and to have left with them that writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters, and that it was preserved among them to the time in question." The words of Jerome relative to Pantaenus are similar[n]:—"Pantænus . . . . . ubi [in India] reperit Bartholomaeum de duodecim apostolis adventum Domini nostri Jesus Christi juxta Matthaei evangelium praedicasse, quod Hebraicis literis scriptum revertens Alexandriam secum retulit." "Pantaenus found that Bartholomew, one of the twelve apostles, had preached, in India, the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel of Matthew, which was written in Hebrew, and which also, on his return to Alexandria, he carried with him."

The same historian gives Origen's testimony in these words[o]:—*πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τὸν ποτὲ τελώνην, ὕστερον δὲ ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ματθαῖον, ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασι, γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον.* "The first was written by Matthew, once a publican, afterwards an

[k] Ap. Euseb. H.E. iii. 39. [l] Advers. Hær. iii. 1. [m] H. E. v. 10.
[n] De Vir. Illustr. c. 36. [o] H. E. vi. 25.

apostle of Jesus Christ, who delivered it to the Jewish believers, composed in the Hebrew language." Eusebius himself says[p]:— *Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ πρότερον Ἑβραίοις κηρύξας, ὡς ἔμελλε καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρους ἰέναι, πατρίῳ γλώττῃ γραφῇ παραδοὺς τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον τὸ λεῖπον τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, κ. τ. λ.* "For Matthew, having first preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to other people, delivered to them, in their own language, the Gospel according to him," etc. etc.

The testimony of Jerome is to the following effect:—"Matthaeus, qui et Levi, ex publicano apostolus, primus in Judea propter eos qui ex circumcisione crediderant, evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit. Quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Caesariensi bibliothecâ, quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaraeis, qui in Beroea urbe Syriae hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit[q]. "Matthew, also called Levi, who from being a publican became an apostle, first of all wrote a Gospel of Christ in Judea in the Hebrew language and letters, for the sake of those of the circumcision who believed: who afterwards translated it into Greek, is uncertain. Moreover, the very Hebrew Gospel is in the library at Caesarea, which was collected with great care by Pamphilus the martyr. With leave of the Nazarenes who live at Beroea, in Syria, and use that volume, I took a copy."

"Evangelium quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae, quod nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque, Matthaei authenticum[r]."—"The Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, which we lately translated from Hebrew into Greek, and which is called by most people the authentic Gospel of Matthew."

"In evangelio juxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum apostolos, sive, ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthaeum, quod et in Caesariensi bibliotheca," etc.[s]—"In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, written in the Syro-Chaldaic language, but in Hebrew characters, which the Nazarenes

[p] H. E. iii. 24.
[q] De Vir. Illustr. cap. iii.
[r] Comment. ad Matth. xii. 13.
[s] Contra Pelagian. iii. 2.

use to the present day; the Gospel according to the apostles, or, as most suppose, according to Matthew, preserved in the library at Caesarea," etc. It is unnecessary to adduce the testimonies of Dorotheus, Epiphanius, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Isidore of Spain, Gregory of Nazianzum, Augustine, Theophylact, and others, inasmuch as they are identical with those already given, and of no importance independently of them.

This ancient testimony in favour of Matthew's Hebrew original requires to be closely examined; because circumstances may possibly be connected with it which serve to impair its strength. Was Papias a credible witness? Eusebius observes concerning him:—*σφόδρα . . . . σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν . . . . . φαίνεται.* "He appears to have been of very weak understanding;" an observation which has been employed to invalidate his testimony. But the judgment of Eusebius was chiefly based on the fact, that Papias understood certain parables of our Lord too literally, and entertained millennarian opinions, to which the historian was strongly opposed. In a mere question of fact, slender abilities are no impediment to the credibility of a witness, if he possess integrity of character. In a court of justice, the testimony of a very young person is all the more strong, because of his undeveloped talents. It may indeed be questioned, whether Eusebius had a favourable opinion of his intellect, irrespective of the millennarian hypothesis. The words of the historian are these:—"It will be worth while to add here, to the statements of Papias already quoted, some other passages, in which he mentions some miracles and other things which had come to him by tradition. We have already related, that Philip the apostle resided with his daughters at Hierapolis. We are now to observe how Papias, who lived at the same period, mentions a wonderful relation he had received from Philip's daughters; for he relates that, in his time, a dead man was raised to life. He mentions also another miracle which happened to Justus, surnamed Barsabas, that he drank deadly poison, and by the grace of the Lord suffered no harm. . . . . The same writer has related other things which he received by unwritten tradition, and some strange parables of our Saviour, and sermons of his, and several other things more

fabulous. Among which he also says, that there shall be a thousand years after the resurrection of the dead, during which the kingdom of Christ shall subsist corporally on this earth. Into which opinion, I suppose, he was led by misunderstanding the apostolical narrations, not perceiving that those things were spoken by them in figures, mystically; for he was a man of very weak understanding, as may be conjectured from his writings. Yet he gave occasion to a great many ecclesiastical writers after him to be of the same opinion, who respected the antiquity of the man; as Irenaeus, and others, who have declared like sentiments[t]."

From this paragraph of Eusebius it would appear, that Papias was but an indifferent expositor of certain parts of Scripture; that he was credulous and inclined to superstition. It will be observed, however, that the remark respecting his weakness of understanding is introduced immediately after the mention of his too literal interpretation of certain things relating to the kingdom of Christ. The words of Papias himself, given by the historian in the beginning of the chapter, shew that he did not collect and record indiscriminately all that he heard:—"For I have never," says he, "like many, delighted to hear those that tell many things, but those that teach the truth; neither those that record foreign precepts, but those that are given from the Lord to our faith, and which came from the truth itself. But if I met with any one who had been a follower of the elders any where, I made it a point to inquire what were the declarations of the elders; what *was said* by Andrew, Peter, or Philip; what by Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other of the disciples of our Lord; what Aristion, and the presbyter John, disciples of the Lord, relate; for I do not think that I derived so much benefit from books, as from the living voice of those who are still surviving." Eusebius himself says elsewhere of Papias[u]:—"A man very eloquent in every respect, and skilled in Scripture," *ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λογιώτατος καὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰδήμων.* These words, it is true, are wanting in the Latin version of Rufinus, and in several ancient MSS. Hence Valerius, Stroth, and others, conclude that they were originally inserted in the text by some scholiast. But the external evidence is, on the whole, in favour of their authenticity.

[t] H. E. iii. 39. [u] H. E. iii. 36.

They are retained and defended by Grabe, Ceillier, Galland, and others.

But Papias has specified the source whence he derived his information respecting Matthew. Although he often relied on tradition, yet, in the present case at least, the tradition was definite and direct. Here *the elder*, i.e. John, was his authority; for after the historian introduces a quotation from Papias relative to Mark and his Gospel, beginning with the words *καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε*, he subjoins *ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱστόρηται τῷ Παπίᾳ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτ' εἴρηται "Ματθαῖος μὲν," κ. τ. λ.* Now it is scarcely possible that Eusebius would have written *περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτ' εἴρηται*, if the information presented in the quotation from Papias immediately following, had not been drawn from the very same source as that contained in the quotation immediately preceding. Hug[1] argues, that we must supply *τῷ Παπίᾳ* to *εἴρηται*, but that does not touch the point in debate; for it may still be true, and it appears from the entire context most probable, that John the elder was Papias's authority for both statements regarding Mark and Matthew. In looking attentively at Eusebius's account of this father, it will be seen that the historian is careful to point out the sources whence the information found in the selections was originally drawn. Thus, in speaking of the wonderful things in Papias's book respecting Philip and Justus, they are represented by the historian as coming to the narrator in the way of *tradition*, lest it should be thought that Aristion and John the presbyter were the authors of such marvellous statements, since it had been just mentioned that Papias was their hearer. Other relations of the ancient father are there referred to unwritten tradition; and, lastly, Aristion and John are mentioned as the sources of information concerning the first two Gospels.

On the whole, it would appear that Papias was a credible and competent witness in the matter before us. Small as his abilities were, he could scarcely have been mistaken if he only possessed honesty. He states that he was inquisitive, that he searched after the sayings of the elders; and he was besides, a hearer of John the

[1] Einleitung in die Schriften des neuen Testaments, vierte Auflage, zweiter Theil, p.16.

Presbyter himself. In the present instance there is no reasonable ground for suspecting his testimony. Although he may have been a bad theologian and expositor, yet in recording what he heard, he must be believed; especially as the author of the statement respecting Matthew's Gospel is indicated.

In regard to Irenaeus, we are not disposed to deny that he was acquainted with Papias's writings, or that he followed him in holding the doctrine of the millennium. It is well known that he had a high veneration for Polycarp; and in designating Papias "a companion of Polycarp, and a hearer of John, an ancient man," his veneration for Papias, Polycarp's associate, also appears. Yet this is far from proving, that Irenaeus followed Papias in believing that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. It is one thing to be led by the authority of Papias in embracing the millennium, and another to believe with him that the apostle wrote in Hebrew. Bishop Marsh also[x] endeavours to prove too much when he attempts to show, that Irenaeus derived his information concerning the original language of Matthew's Gospel from Polycarp. It is probable that he would not have held the opinion, had he known that Polycarp believed otherwise; but this is all that can be affirmed.

The original words of Irenaeus have given rise to misapprehension and critical conjecture. Hales[y] and Glöckler[z] understand the conjunction *καί* in the sense of *also*, as if Matthew had written his Gospel in Aramaean, *as well as in Greek*. Bloomfield[a] would alter *γραφὴν* into *γραφῇ*, *εὐαγγελίου* into *εὐαγγέλιον*, and expunge *καί*. This is arbitrary. The conjunction signifies *also*, the passage denoting that Matthew delivered his Gospel or the substance of it *orally by preaching*, and *also* in writing. *Γραφὴν εὐαγγελίου* means *the written Gospel*, equivalent to *γεγραμμένον εὐαγγέλιον*.

Pantaenus is the third witness, as given by Eusebius; and great stress must be laid on his testimony, because it is unquestionably independent of Papias. Though other writers should have had no better authority for their opinion than Papias, Pan-

[x] Notes to Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, vol. iii. part 2, p. 3, et seq. 2nd edition, 1802.

[y] New Analysis of Chronology, vol. iii. p. 11. 2nd edition.

[z] Die Evangelien des Matth., Marc. und Lucas in Uebereinstimmung gebracht und erklärt, vol. i. p. 6.

[a] Greek Testament with notes, first note to Matthew.

taenus at least could not have acquired his knowledge from that source. The account of Pantaenus going to India was indeed *a tradition*, for Eusebius in introducing it employs the word λέγεται, *it is said;* but the historian himself appears to have received it as correct. Again, though it were *a report* that he found the Gospel of Matthew there, λόγος εὑρεῖν αὐτὸν, κ. τ. λ., we are not at liberty to infer at once the falseness of it, especially as it coincides with previous testimonies. Nor is it easy to account for the report, on the supposition that an Aramaean Gospel never existed. The very report presupposes the possibility, or rather the probability, of an Aramaean Gospel. Harless attempts to weaken the force of the words by representing them as indefinite [b]. He conceives that it cannot be known from them, whether the work was written in Aramaean by Matthew, or translated into that language by Bartholomew or some other person. Nothing is affirmed about the original language of the Gospel by Matthew: it is merely stated that Bartholomew left to those to whom he had preached, the Gospel in the Hebrew character. But if Bartholomew *left* them an Aramaean Gospel, neither he nor any other would have translated it out of the Greek into the *Aramaean* to be left among the inhabitants of *India*. He would have rendered it into the language of the country. By India is probably meant Southern Arabia; and consequently the persons to whom Bartholomew preached there were *Jewish Christians*, who, from not coming in contact with a Greek-speaking population, as the Jews of Palestine did, were not acquainted with Greek. If then a version had been made by Bartholomew from the Greek, it would have been into *Arabic*. The Gospel was not intended ultimately for Jews alone, but for Jews and Gentiles. The Jews in Arabia would soon learn the language of the people among whom they lived. Hence the version would have been made into a language which *all* the inhabitants of the country might understand. In this way the Jews would be equally benefited; while others too would be instructed. Whoever made the alleged version into Aramaean, in Southern Arabia, must have possessed little wisdom or benevolence in not adapting his work to the inhabitants at large, as well as to a small part of them who might, after all, be the least

[b] See his Programm delivered at Erlangen, 1841, p.12.

disposed to receive it. We infer, therefore, that Bartholomew *took with him* to the Indians or Arabians the Gospel of Matthew written in Aramaean.

We come now to Origen, whose testimony, according to Harless, so nearly resembles that of Irenaeus, that it must be resolved into it. But the similarity is not obvious. Both speak of the Gospels in succession, and *agree* in opinion respecting the original language of Matthew. But the most learned, and in many respects the most acute of the fathers, whose critical inquiries in Palestine were occupied with the original text of the New Testament, and who examined many manuscripts, was of all others the least disposed to receive such an opinion, solely on the credit of Irenaeus, or of any preceding author. It is true that Eusebius says ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθών, words which he gives as Origen's, not his own; but that is simply a proof of the prevalent belief of Origen's age. Probably he did not examine the point with care, because he thought it unnecessary. He was satisfied that the current opinion was correct. The tradition was general in his day; and he adopted it as true without presuming to call it in question. And yet his studies would have necessarily led him to perceive its unsoundness, had it rested on a frail basis.

The testimony of Eusebius is also valuable; for it cannot be resolved into the authority of Papias. If he was an enemy to millennarianism, and had but a poor opinion of Papias's abilities, deeming him unworthy of credit even in recording a plain matter of fact, it is not probable that he would have followed him in holding the original language of Matthew to be Aramaean. It is said, indeed, that, in his capacity of historian, he does not profess to act the part of a critic, but merely records. Yet he very often pronounces his own opinion; and in the chapter referred to, it is tolerably certain that he states what he himself believed. The results there given seem to have been those at which he himself had arrived, whatever may have been the sentiments of others. He had no doubt of their truth, as far as we can judge from the strain of the whole chapter. There is no reason for supposing that he did not agree with the current belief of the age. Had he been dissatisfied with it, he would not have written as he does. We deem it hardly necessary to allude to the argument advanced

by Hug[c], to shew that Eusebius exhibits a different opinion in another place, were it not that it has been repeated after him by Prof. Stuart. In this father's commentary on the Psalms, we find the words *ἀντὶ τοῦ φθέγξομαι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, Ἑβραῖος ὢν ὁ Ματθαῖος οἰκείᾳ ἐκδόσει κέχρηται, εἰπών· ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς* (78, 2), which Hug interprets as meaning that "Matthew, as one who was himself master of the Hebrew language, deserted the Septuagint rendering, and gave his own Greek translation." Hence the conclusion is unavoidable, that the apostle wrote in Greek. But the term *ἔκδοσις* does not signify *translation.* It denotes *recension* The phrase *Ἑβραῖος ὢν* indicates the native country of the apostle, and so determines the sense of *οἰκεῖος.* Matthew, being a Hebrew, used *that recension* of the Old Testament text which was current in his native land; and had the Hebrew words to which *ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα, κ. τ. λ.*, and not *φθέγξομαι, κ. τ. λ.* correspond.

But it is scarcely possible to do justice to the whole question, without examining Jerome's writings in relation to it, although that father belongs to a late period. The subject becomes complicated when viewed in the light of his testimony, because a certain Gospel used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites is introduced.

The following positions are deducible from Jerome's writings:—

1. The authentic Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew.
2. The Gospel according to the Hebrews was used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites.
3. This Gospel was identical with the Aramaean original of Matthew.

1. The truth of this proposition is implied in the following words:—"Matthaeus . . . . . primus in Judea propter eos qui ex circumcisione crediderant, evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit, quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est," etc.

2. This is proved by such expressions as these:—"Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos, et a me nuper in Graecum Latinumque sermonem translatum est," etc. "Evange-

[c] Introduction to the New Testament, translated by Fosdick, p. 320.

lium quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone transtulimus," etc.

3. The following passage affords evidence of the truth of this position:—"Matthaeus . . . . . primus in Judea propter eos, qui ex circumcisione crediderant, evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit; quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Caesariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaraeis, qui in Beroea urbe Syriae hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit."

Surely the testimony of one who translated the Aramaean copy in the hands of the Nazarenes, into Greek and Latin, as to the identity of it with the original Gospel of Matthew, is important; especially since Jerome was well acquainted with Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. In philology he was not behind the chief of the fathers. Objections, however, have been made to the opinion advanced by Jerome, viz. that the Gospel of the Hebrews proceeded from Matthew himself. It is not denied that he thought so at first; but he is said to have subsequently retracted his sentiments. That he afterwards entertained doubts of the identity of the Aramaean original with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, is said to be indicated by the use of the words, "*vocatur a plerisque* Matthaei authenticum; *ut plerique autumant; quod appellatur* secundum Hebræos; *Qui* legerit Canticum Canticorum et sponsum animae Dei sermonem intellexerit, *credideritque* Evangelio, quod secundum Hebræos editum, nuper transtulimus," etc. It has been thought that such expressions denote a lurking suspicion in his mind; and that without *expressly* avowing a change in sentiment, he *virtually* does so, by attributing to *the many*, or to *most people*, what he himself had once believed.

The passage first quoted, especially as it was written after Jerome had translated the document into Greek and Latin, stands in the way of this assumption; because the father had then all the evidence which he could possibly have had afterwards. It will not avail to affirm that he first *copied*, as signified by the term *describendi;* and while intent on transcribing, paid little regard to the contents of the Gospel in question. However plausible it may be to say, that he did not compare it at that time with

the canonical Greek of Matthew, being simply desirous of taking a copy which he could examine at leisure, the assertion is inadmissible. Though it may be alleged, that the single passage in which he identifies the Gospel of the Hebrews with the original Aramaean production of the apostle, was written *soon after* he had transcribed the former, and *before* he had examined or translated it, the allegation will not bear scrutiny. In another passage in the same work (*de viris illustr.*), *before* that in which Jerome identifies the documents, he writes:—"Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos, et a me nuper in Graecum Latinumque sermonem translatum est," etc. Here he speaks of having already translated the Gospel of the Nazarenes; and, therefore, in characterising it as *quod appellatur* secundum Hebraeos, no doubt is thrown out against it. Hence it is arbitrary to assume an interval of time between the act of copying, and that of translating. When Credner[d] conjectures that the words, *porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Caesariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaraeis, qui in Beroea urbe Syriae hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit*, were originally a remark written by Jerome himself on the margin, before he had examined the document, the assumption is opposedto the context immediately following, *in quo animadvertendum*, etc.

There is no sufficient evidence for supposing that a change occurred in Jerome's opinion. Whatever sentiments he held after translating the Aramaean document, he appears to have retained subsequently. If he believed at that time, that the original Hebrew Gospel was found in the production used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, he believed it afterwards. If he had doubts in his mind then, they continued to remain. Perhaps he was never *wholly* satisfied as to the matter; though it would seem that he could not conscientiously contradict the current belief of his contemporaries. He acquiesced in the established opinion, because, as far as his judgment was exercised on the question, he saw no valid reason for rejecting it. When we look at all the passages in his works relating to the subject before us, we are disposed to conclude, that actual inspection did not dislodge from his mind

[d] Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften, vol. i. p. 394.

the notion of having discovered the true Aramaean original. He still believed as before in the identity of the Nazarene copy with the true Gospel of the apostle. After seeing, reading and translating it into two languages, his former view continued. The document bore considerable resemblance to the Greek Gospel of Matthew, as far as we can form a judgment of it from the few remains which have been preserved. Its contents agreed to a great extent with those of Matthew's canonical Gospel; though they also exhibited deviations from the latter. There was substantial likeness, with diversities partly absurd and ridiculous. That it differed from the Greek canonical Gospel is sufficiently indicated by the fact of his translating it into Greek. Had it wholly agreed with the canonical Greek Gospel as then current, he would hardly have undertaken the superfluous task of rendering it into Greek. It was so like the Greek Gospel as to be taken for its Aramaean original; and yet the diversities were such as led him to think that it would not be a work of supererogation to translate it into Greek. The expressions on which his change of belief is founded, may be more satisfactorily explained on other grounds. It should be recollected, that additions had been made to the document by those in whose hands it was preserved, sufficient to create some difficulty in the mind as to whether it had really proceeded from the apostle. Then again the sect who used it, were beginning to be considered *heretical* by the body of catholic Christians. Their Gospel was not in good repute. On the contrary, it was justly looked on with suspicion. Besides, Jerome was most jealous of his fair name and unsullied orthodoxy. Most cautious was he in expressing any opinion at variance with the current sentiments of his age, or likely to draw suspicion on him of departing from them. To his timid mind, it might have appeared somewhat hazardous to identify the document peculiar to a sect occupying a doubtful relation to the catholic church, with the authentic Aramaean. Far safer would it have been to affirm the loss of the original; although the conviction of his mind would not allow him to speak insincerely.

We have now to consider Epiphanius's testimony. The following positions are taken from his work against Heresies.

1. The authentic Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew.

2. The Gospel according to the Hebrews was used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites.

3. This Gospel was identical with the Aramaean original of Matthew.

4. While the Gospel used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites was *substantially* the same, there were some differences between them.

The first three positions coincide with those already deduced from Jerome's works. The last is additional to them.

1. This is asserted in the words:—*Ἔχουσι δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον Ἑβραΐστί. Παρ' αὐτοῖς γὰρ σαφῶς τοῦτο, καθὼς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγράφη Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν, ἔτι σώζεται.*[e] "They [the Nazarenes] have the Gospel, according to Matthew, entire in Hebrew; for among them this Gospel is undoubtedly still preserved, as it was written at first, in the Hebrew language."

2. This is proved by the preceding passage taken in connexion with the following:—*Καὶ δέχονται μὲν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον . . . . . Καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ κατὰ Ἑβραίους, ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἐστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνος Ἑβραϊστὶ καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ἐποιήσατο τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔκθεσίν τε καὶ κήρυγμα.*[f] "They [the Ebionites] also receive the Gospel according to Matthew; this only they use. And they call it, *according to the Hebrews*, as one may truly say that Matthew alone made the publication and proclamation of his Gospel in the New Testament, in Hebrew and in Hebrew characters." Besides, the Cyprian bishop speaks of both Gospels under the same appellations, viz. *κατὰ Ματθαῖον* and *εὐαγγέλιον Ἑβραϊκόν*. This circumstance appears to indicate, that he agreed with Jerome in regarding them as the same, as far as his knowledge of the Nazarene copy extended; for it is not probable that he saw it, but judged of it merely by report.

3. The passages just quoted clearly imply this position.

4. At first sight this may be thought contradictory to No. 2; but it is not really so. Nor did Jerome fall into error in asserting in express terms the identity of the Gospel used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites. Epiphanius, however, who was educated among the Jews, and acquainted with their language, has given extracts from the Gospel of the Ebionites, which indicate some dissimilarity

[e] Haeres, xxix. § 9. [f] Ibid. xxx. § 3.

to that used by the Nazarenes. Thus two passages relative to the baptism of Christ, one quoted by Jerome from the Gospel of the Nazarenes, the other by Epiphanius from the Gospel of the Ebionites, are very different. Epiphanius also asserts, that the Ebionite document wanted the genealogy at the commencement; while it is probable that the Nazarene copy had it, that father calling the latter *entire*, the other *not entire*, but *corrupted and curtailed*.

But it is argued by Paulus[g], Theile[h], and Credner[i], that the language of the Gospel used by the Nazarenes must have been originally Greek. The same conclusion is drawn in regard to the language of the Ebionite Gospel, so far as it may be considered distinct from the Nazarene. Although existing in Aramaean in the time of Jerome, it is contended that their original language was Greek. Let us examine the supposed proofs.

In respect to the Nazarene document, Jerome affirms, that *Barabbas* was interpreted in it *filius magistri eorum*. Thus the translator fell into the error of putting בר רבהן, instead of *βαραββᾶν*. He mistook the etymology of the word *βαραββᾶς*, not knowing that it is simply בר אבא, *son of a father*. But the expression, *filius magistri eorum*, is only a witty explanation of the proper name *βαραββᾶς*, intended to throw contempt on the Jews who requested Barabbas to be released rather than Jesus. It imports, that both the Jews and Barabbas had the same master and father, i. e. Satan.

Again, it is contended that the language of the Ebionite document was originally Greek. In speaking of John Baptist's food, it has *μέλι ἄγριον, οὗ ἡ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ μάννα, ὡς ἐγκρὶς ἐν ἐλαίῳ*: "wild honey, whose taste was like manna, or cakes made with honey and oil." According to this assumption, the author of the Aramaean document must have used our Greek Gospel, where he either read *ἐγκρίδας* for *ἀκρίδας*, or rendered *ἀκρίδας* by an Aramaean word equivalent to *ἐγκρίδας*, which Aramaean term was re-rendered *ἐγκρίδες* by Epiphanius, or by the translator of the Greek copy which that father had. But the introduction of *ἐγκρίδες* must be referred to another source. Whoever made the

[g] Exegetisches Conservatorium, vol. i. p. 143.
[h] In the Neues kritisches Journal der theologischen Literatur, vol. i. p. 201.
[i] Beiträge, vol. i. p. 345, et seq.

addition to μέλι ἄγριον, by describing it οὗ ἡ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ μάννα, ὡς ἐγκρὶς ἐν ἐλαίῳ, had respect to Numbers xi. 8, where it is said of the manna טעמו כטעם לשד השמן. This description was annexed in Aramaean to the Aramaean of μέλι ἄγριον. But the Greek translator of the copy which Epiphanius had, looked at the Septuagint version of Numbers xi. 8, where he found ἐγκρὶς ἐξ ἐλαίου, which words he adopted. Thus the mistake was made by the translator of the Greek copy of the Aramaean which Epiphanius either possessed or saw, and does not prove the Greek original of the Ebionite Gospel.

We shall now quote all the notices of this Hebrew Gospel found in the works of the fathers.

Eusebius relates of Papias:—Ἐκτέθειται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς, ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου, ἣν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει[k]:—"He mentions also another history concerning a woman accused before the Lord of many sins, which is contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews." These words do not at all imply that Papias had seen or used the Gospel of the Hebrews; they merely affirm that he had set forth a certain history which was found in it. It appears to us more probable, that Papias received the account of the woman by tradition, than that he extracted it from the document. The words ἣν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει, more naturally belong to Eusebius as a remark of his own; and had the story been taken from the Gospel, there is no reason why the historian should not have said so unambiguously. The passage affords no evidence of the fact, that Papias saw or made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Eusebius, writing of Hegesippus, says:—Ἔκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου, καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραΐδος διαλέκτου, τινὰ τίθησιν, ἐμφαίνων ἐξ Ἑβραίων ἑαυτὸν πεπιστευκέναι[l]:—"He also sets forth some things from the Gospel of the Hebrews and the Syriac, and particularly from the Hebrew language, shewing that he himself was a convert from the Hebrews." We know nothing of the state of the Gospel in the time of Hegesippus, because in the fragments of his works still preserved, no quotation

[k] H. E. iii. 39. [l] Ib. iv. 22.

from it appears. The passage in Eusebius, on the supposition of its reference to the document in question, throws no light on its nature.

In the epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrnians, we find these words:—*Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον*[m]. "Take, handle me and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit." Jerome says, that these words were in the Gospel of the Hebrews. Whether Ignatius took them from that document is another question. We learn from Origen that they also existed in the *κήρυγμα Πέτρου*. Hence Ignatius may have taken them from the latter; or perhaps, as Pearson thinks, he got them by tradition; which gave rise to their insertion in both documents. Jerome does not state, that Ignatius took them from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as Grabe thinks[n]; but merely that they were in it in his time.

Clement of Alexandria quotes a passage expressly from the Hebrew Gospel:—*Κἂν τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίῳ, ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει, γέγραπται, καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαυθήσεται*[o]. "And it is written in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, 'He who admires, shall reign; and he who reigns, shall be at ease.'"

Origen gives two passages from it in his extant works:—*Ἐὰν δὲ προσίεταί τις τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον, ἔνθα αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ φησιν, Ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου, καὶ ἀπένεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ*[p]. "But if any one will receive the Gospel according to the Hebrews, in which the Saviour himself says, My mother, the Holy Ghost, lately took me by one of my hairs, and carried me away to the great mountain Thabor," etc.

The second passage exists only in the old Latin version:—"Age aliter tractemus hunc locum.—Scriptum est in evangelio quodam, quod dicitur *secundum Hebraeos*, si tamen placet alicui suscipere illud non ad auctoritatem, sed ad manifestationem propositae quaestionis. *Dixit*, inquit, *ad eum alter divitum: magister, quid bonum faciens vivam? dixit ei: homo, leges et prophetas fac. Respondit ad eum: feci. Dixit ei: vade vende omnia quae possides et divide pauperibus, et veni, sequere me. Coepit autem dives*

[m] iv. p. 103 of Hefele's second edition of the Patres Apostolici.
[n] Spicilegium SS. Patrum, etc. vol. i. p. 25.
[o] Stromata, ii.
[p] Comment. in Joann. vol. iv. p. 63. ed. Delarue.

scalpere caput suum, et non placuit ei. Et dixit ad eum Dominus: Quomodo dicis legem feci et prophetas, quoniam scriptum est in lege: Diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum, et ecce multi fratres tui filii Abrahae amicti sunt stercore, morientes prae fame, et domus tua plena est multis bonis, et non egreditur omnino aliquid ex ea ad eos. Et conversus dixit Simoni discipulo suo sedenti apud se: Simon fili Joannae, facilius est camelum intrare per foramen acûs, quam divitem in regnum coelorum"[q]. "It is written in a certain Gospel, which is entitled according to the Hebrews, if any one please to receive it, not as of authority, but for illustration of the present question: Another rich man, says that Gospel, said to him, Master, what good thing shall I do that I may live? He said to him, O man, keep the laws and the prophets. He answered him, I have done so. He said to him, Go, sell all things which thou hast and distribute among the poor, and come and follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head, and was displeased. And the Lord said to him, How can you say that you have kept the law and the prophets, since it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; and behold many of thy brethren, children of Abraham, are clothed with nastiness, and ready to perish with hunger, while thy house is full of many good things, and nothing is sent out of it to them. And turning, he said to his disciple Simon, who sat beside him; Simon, son of Joanna, it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Jerome says[r], that Origen often cited this Gospel, and there is no good reason for doubting his testimony, merely because in the extant works of the Alexandrian father, only two passages from it are found.

Eusebius, speaking of the books called *Νόθοι*, adds:—*ἤδη δ' ἐν τούτοις τινὲς καὶ τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον κατέλεξαν, ᾧ μάλιστα Ἑβραίων οἱ τὸν Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι χαίρουσι*[s]. "In this number some have placed the Gospel according to the Hebrews, with which those of the Hebrews who have received Christ are most delighted."

Speaking of the Ebionites, the same historian writes[t]: *Εὐαγ-*

[q] In Matth. xix. 19. vol. iii. p. 671.
[r] De Vir. Illustr.
[s] H. E. iii. 25.
[t] H. E. iii. 27.

γελίῳ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίους λεγομένῳ χρώμενοι, κ. τ. λ. "They use only that Gospel, which is called, according to the Hebrews." None of the passages in which Eusebius speaks of this Gospel, betrays an intimate acquaintance with it. He never quotes it. He seems to have known no more of it than the title. This ignorance is shewn by the fact, that in speaking of the passage in Ignatius' epistle to the Smyrnians, he confesses he did not know whence it was taken, although Jerome, at a later period, says, that it was in the Gospel of the Hebrews. Hence Eusebius could not have seen or made use of the Gospel in question.

Epiphanius writes of the Ebionites:—*Καὶ δέχονται μὲν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον· τούτῳ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοί, ὡς καὶ οἱ κατὰ Κήρινθον, χρῶνται. Καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ κατὰ Ἑβραίους ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἐστι εἰπεῖν, ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνος ἑβραϊστὶ καὶ ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ἐποιήσατο τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔκθεσίν τε καὶ κήρυγμα.*[u] "And they also receive the Gospel according to Matthew. For this is the only Gospel which both they and the Cerinthians make use of. And they call it the Gospel according to the Hebrews; for the truth is, that Matthew is the only one of the New Testament writers who published his Gospel and Preaching in the Hebrew language and Hebrew characters."

Again:—*Ἐν τῷ γοῦν παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζομένῳ, οὐχ' ὅλῳ δὲ πληρεστάτῳ, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ καὶ ἠκροτηριασμένῳ, Ἑβραϊκὸν δὲ τοῦτο καλοῦσι, ἐμφέρεται, ὅτι ἐγένετό τις ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὃς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. Καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἶπε· παρερχόμενος παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβεριάδος ἐξελεξάμην Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Σίμωνα, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν, καὶ Θαδδαῖον, καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν ζηλωτήν, καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, καὶ σὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου ἐκάλεσα, καὶ ἠκολούθησάς μοι. Ὑμᾶς οὖν βούλομαι εἶναι δεκαδύο ἀποστόλους, εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων καὶ ἐξῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθησαν, καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα. Καὶ εἶχεν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ τὸ*

[u] Haeres. xxx. § 3. note.

βρῶμα αὐτοῦ, φησι, μέλι ἄγριον, οὗ ἡ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ μάννα, ὡς· ἐγκρὶς ἐν ἐλαίῳ· ἵνα δῆθεν μεταστρέψωσι τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς ψεῦδος, καὶ ἀντὶ ἀκρίδων ποιήσωσιν ἐγκρίδας ἐν μέλιτι. Ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίου ἔχει· ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένους Ἀαρὼν τοῦ ἱερέως, παῖς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἐλισάβετ, καὶ ἐξήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν πολλά, ἐπιφέρει, ὅτι τοῦ λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος ἦλθε καὶ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου. Καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν. Καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσα. σύ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. Καὶ πάλιν ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα. Ὃν ἰδών, φησιν, ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ τίς εἶ, Κύριε; Καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐφ' ὃν εὐδόκησα. Καὶ τότε, φησιν, ὁ Ἰωάννης παραπεσὼν αὐτῷ ἔλεγε· δέομαί σου, Κύριε, σύ με βάπτισον. Ὁ δὲ ἐκώλυεν αὐτῷ λέγων· ἄφες, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα . . . . . παρακόψαντες τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ γενεαλογίας ἄρχονται τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιεῖσθαι, ὡς προεῖπον λέγοντες, ὅτι ἐγένετό, φησιν, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Καϊάφα, ἦλθέ τις Ἰωάννης ὀνόματι βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ Ἰορδάνῃ καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.[x] "In that Gospel which is called among them the Gospel according to Matthew, which is not entire and perfect, but corrupted and abridged, and they call it the Hebrew Gospel, it is written, that there was a certain man called Jesus, and he was about thirty years of age, who made choice of us. And coming to Capernaum, he entered into the house of Simon surnamed Peter, and opening his mouth, said, When I passed by the lake of Tiberias, I chose John and James, the sons of Zebedee, and Simon, and Andrew, and Thaddaeus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas Iscariot; and thee, Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom, I called, and thou didst follow me. I will, therefore, that ye be my twelve apostles for a testimony to Israel. And John was baptising, and the Pharisees went out to him and were baptised, and all Jerusalem.

[x] Haer. xxx. § 13.

And John had his garment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his meat (according to that Gospel) was wild honey, the taste of which was like manna, as cakes made of honey and oil: that thus they might change the true account into a falsehood, and, instead of locusts, put cakes made with oil and honey. And the beginning of their Gospel was this :—It came to pass in the days of Herod, the king of Judea, that John came baptising with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan, who was reported to be of the family of Aaron the priest, the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, and all went out to him. And after many things, it is said in this Gospel: that the people being baptised, Jesus also went and was baptised by John; and when He ascended out of the water the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in form of a dove descending and entering into him. And a voice came from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased; and again, This day I have begotten thee. And immediately a great light shone around the place, which when John saw (says this Gospel) he said to him, Who art thou Lord? and then another voice from heaven came to him, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And then, according to this Gospel, John fell down before him and said, O Lord, I pray thee, baptise me; but he forbade him, saying, that thus it is becoming that all things should be fulfilled. . . . . They have taken away the genealogy from Matthew, and begin their Gospel, as I have already said, with the words: It came to pass in the days of Herod, king of Judea, in the time of Caiaphas, high priest, a certain man named John came baptising with the baptism of repentance, in the river Jordan, etc."

Again:—*τὸ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγέλιον καλούμενον περιέχει ὅτι ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσίας, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ παύσησθε τοῦ θύειν, οὐ παύσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ ὀργή*[y]. "It is contained in their Gospel: I came to abolish sacrifices, and unless ye cease to offer sacrifices, the wrath of God shall not cease from you."

And again:—*αὐτοὶ δὲ . . . . . ἤλλαξαν τὸ ῥητόν . . . . . καὶ ἐποίησαν τοὺς μαθητὰς μὲν λέγοντας· ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμέν σοι τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν· καὶ αὐτὸν δῆθεν λέγοντα· μὴ ἐπιθυμίᾳ*

[y] xxx. s. 16.

ἐπεθύμησα κρέας τοῦτο πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν[z]. "They [the Ebionites] have changed that which was said, and have represented the disciples saying to Jesus, Where wilt thou that we make ready for thee to eat the passover; to whom he replies, Have I greatly desired to eat this flesh, as a paschal supper, with you?"

Still farther: φασὶ . . . . . ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ εἶναι ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος[a]. "They say, It is sufficient for the disciple to be as the master."

From the preceding extracts it is manifest that Epiphanius saw and knew the Gospel used by the Ebionites. He does not appear, however, to have been acquainted with that used by the Nazarenes, because he states, "I know not whether they have taken away the genealogy from Abraham to Christ."

Jerome writes concerning the Gospel of the Hebrews, and gives extracts thus:—Matthaeus, qui et Levi, ex publicano apostolus, primus in Judaea propter eos, qui ex circumcisione crediderant, Evangelium Christi hebraicis literis verbisque composuit: quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Caesariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus Martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaraeis, qui in Beroea urbe Syriae hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit. In quo animadvertendum quod ubicumque Evangelista, sive ex persona sua, sive ex persona Domini salvatoris, veteris scripturae testimoniis abutitur, non sequatur LXX. translatorum auctoritatem, sed hebraicam: e quibus illa duo sunt: *Ex Ægypto vocavi filium meum;* et: *Quoniam Nazaraeus vocabitur*[b]. "Matthew, also called Levi, who from being a publican became an apostle, was the first who composed a Gospel of Christ; and, for the sake of those among the Jews who believed in Christ, wrote it in the Hebrew language and letters. It is uncertain who was the person that afterwards translated it into Greek. Moreover the Hebrew copy itself is to this day preserved in the library of Caesarea, which Pamphilus the martyr collected with very great diligence. The Nazaraeans, who live in Beroea, a city of Syria,

[z] xxx. s. 22. [a] xxx. s. 26.

[b] De vir. illustr. 3.

and use this volume, gave me leave to write it out; in which this is to be observed, that wherever the evangelist either cites himself, or introduces our Saviour as citing, any passage out of the Old Testament, he does not follow the translation of the LXX., but the Hebrew, of which are these two examples: Out of Egypt have I called my Son: And: He shall be called a Nazarene."

Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos, et a me nuper in Graecum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes saepe utitur, post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert: *Dominus autem cum dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei; juraverat enim Jacobus se non comesturum panem ab illa hora qua libarat calicem Domini, donec videret Dominum resurgentem a mortuis; rursusque post paululum: Afferte ait Dominus mensam et panem;* statimque additur, *Tulit panem, et benedixit, et fregit, ac dedit Jacobo Justo et dixit ei, Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit filius hominis a dormientibus*[c]. "The Gospel also, which is according to the Hebrews, and which I lately translated into Greek and Latin, and which Origen often used, relates, that after the Saviour's resurrection, when our Lord had given the linen cloth to the priest's servant, he went to James and appeared to him; for James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour in which he drank the cup of the Lord, till he should see the Lord risen from the dead. And again a little after, the Lord said, Bring the table and the bread; and it is immediately added, He took the bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to James the Just, and said to him; My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man is risen from the dead."

In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum apostolos, sive, ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthaeum, quod et in Caesariensi habetur bibliotheca, narratur historia; *Ecce mater Domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei; Joannes baptista baptisat in remissionem peccatorum; eamus, et baptizemur ab eo; dixit autem eis, Quid peccavi ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi, ignorantia est.* Et in eodem

[c] De Vir. Illustr. 2.

volumine, *Si peccaverit*, inquit, *frater tuus in verbo, et satis tibi fecerit, septies in die suscipe eum. Dixit illi Simon discipulus ejus, Septies in die? respondit Dominus et dixit ei, Etiam, ego dico tibi, Usque ad septuagesies septies*[d]. "In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is written in the Chaldee and Syriac language, which the Nazarenes use, and is that according to the apostles, or, as most think, according to Matthew, which is kept in the library of Caesarea, there is the following story: Behold, the mother and the brethren of Christ spake to him: 'John the Baptist baptises for the remission of sins; let us go and be baptised by him.' He said to them: 'In what have I sinned, that I have any need to go and be baptised by him? unless my saying this proceed perhaps from ignorance.' And in the same volume, it is said: 'If thy brother offend thee by a word, and make thee satisfaction, though it be seven times in a day, thou must forgive him.' Simon, his disciple, said to him: Seven times in a day!' The Lord answered and said to him: 'I tell thee also, even till seventy times seven.'"

Juxta Evangelium, quod Hebraeo sermone conscriptum legunt Nazaraei: Descendet super eum omnis fons Spiritus Sancti. . . . . Porro in Evangelio cujus supra fecimus mentionem, haec scripta reperimus: *Factum est autem, quum ascendisset Dominus de aquâ, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti et requievit super eum, et dixit illi: Fili mi, in omnibus prophetis expectabam te, ut venires, et requiescerem in te. Tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum*[e]. "According to the Gospel which is written in the Hebrew language, and read by the Nazarenes, the whole fountain of the Holy Ghost will descend upon him. . . . . Moreover, in that Gospel just mentioned, we find these things written: 'It came to pass when the Lord had ascended from the water, the whole fountain of the Holy Ghost descended and rested upon him, and said to him: My son, among all the prophets I was waiting for thy coming, that I might rest upon thee; for thou art my rest; thou art my first begotten son, who reignest for ever.'"

Qui legerit Canticum Canticorum, et Sponsum animae Dei Sermonem intellexerit, crediderítque Evangelio, quod secundum Hebraeos editum nuper transtulimus, in quo ex persona Salvatoris

[d] Contra Pelagian. iii. [e] Comment in Jesai. xi. 1.

dicitur: *Modo tulit me, mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus, in uno capillorum meorum;* non dubitabit dicere Sermonem Dei ortum esse de Spiritu, et animam quae Sponsa Sermonis est, habere socrum Spiritum Sanctum, qui apud Hebraeos genere dicitur foeminino: Rua[f]. "Whoever reads the book of Canticles, and will understand by the Spouse of the soul the Word of God, and will believe the Gospel which is entitled according to the Hebrews, which I lately translated, in which the Saviour is introduced, saying: 'Just now, my mother, the Holy Ghost, laid hold of me by one of my hairs,' will not scruple to say, the Word of God was born of the Spirit, and the soul, which is the Spouse of the Word, has the Holy Ghost for its mother-in-law, who in the Hebrew language is expressed in the feminine gender, *Rua.*"

Sed et in Evangelio, quod juxta Hebraeos scriptum Nazaraei lectitant, Dominus loquitur: *Modo tulit me mater mea Spiritus Sanctus*[g]. "But it is written in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which the Nazarenes read, The Lord said: 'The Holy Spirit, my mother, just now laid hold of me.'"

In Evangelio, quod juxta Hebraeos Nazaraei legere consueverunt, inter maxima ponitur crimina, qui fratris sui spiritum contristaverit[h]. "In that Gospel, which is entitled according to the Hebrews, and which the Nazarenes are accustomed to read, it is reckoned among the chief of crimes for a person to make sorrowful the spirit of his brother."

In Evangelio, quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos, pro *supersubstantiali pane* reperi: *Mahar*, quod dicitur crastinum, ut sit sensus: *Panem nostrum crastinum*, i.e. futurum *da nobis*[i]. "In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, I find instead of super-substantial bread, *Mahar*, which signifies the morrow. So the sense is: Give us this day the bread necessary for the morrow, i.e. for the future."

In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae (quod nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum), homo iste qui aridam habet manum coementarius scribitur istiusmodi vocibus auxilium precans: *Coementarius eram, manibus victum quaeritans; precor te, Jesu, ut mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos*[k]. "In the

[f] Comment. in Mic. vii. 6. [g] Comment. in Jesai. xl. 11.
[h] Comment. in Ezek. xviii. 7. [i] Comment. in Matth. vi. 11. [k] Ibid. xii. 13.

Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use (which I lately translated out of Hebrew into Greek, and which is called by most the authentic Gospel of Matthew), the man who had the withered hand is said to be a mason, and prayed for relief in the following words: 'I was a mason who earned my livelihood by my hands; I beseech thee, Jesus, that thou wouldest restore my health, that I may not shamefully beg my bread.'"

In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni, pro filio Barachiae *filium Joiadae* reperimus scriptum[l]. "In the Gospel which the Nazarenes use, for the son of Barachias I find written the son of Joiada."

Iste [Barabbas] in Evangelio quod scribitur juxta Hebraeos *filius magistri eorum* interpretatur, qui propter seditionem et homicidium fuerat condemnatus[m]. "In the Gospel entitled, according to the Hebrews, he is interpreted the Son of their master, who was condemned for sedition and murder."

In Evangelio autem quod Hebraicis literis scriptum est legimus, non velum templi scissum, sed superliminare templum mirae magnitudinis corruisse[n]. "In the Gospel which is written in Hebrew letters, we read, not that the vail of the temple was rent, but that a beam of a wonderful size fell down."

In Hebraico quoque Evangelio, legimus Dominum ad discipulos loquentem, *et nunquam*, inquit, *laeti sitis nisi cum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate*[o]. "In the Hebrew Gospel we read, that the Lord said to his disciples: 'Be ye never cheerful, unless when ye can see your brother in love.'"

Cum enim apostoli eum putarent spiritum, vel juxta Evangelium quod lectitant Nazaraei, *incorporale daemonium*, dixit eis, quid turbati estis, etc.[p] "For, when the apostles thought he was a spirit, or, according to the Gospel which the Nazarenes read, an incorporeal demon, he said to them: 'Why are you troubled?' etc."

In epistola ad Smyrnaeos—de Evangelio quod nuper a me translatum est, super persona Christi ponit testimonium dicens: Ego vero et post resurrectionem in carne eum vidi, et credo quia sit; et quando venit ad Petrum et ad eos qui cum Petro erant, dixit eis: *Ecce, palpate me, et videte quia non sum daemonium incorporale.* Et statim tetigerunt eum et crediderunt[q]. "In the epistle to the

[l] Comment. in Matth. xxiii. 35.
[m] Ibid. xxvii. 16.
[n] Epist. ad Hedibiam. 120.
[o] Comm. in Epist. ad Ephes. v. 3.
[p] Praefat. Comm. in Jesai. lib. xviii.
[q] De Vir. Illustr. 16.

Smyrnians, he takes a testimony from the Gospel, which lately translated, as spoken by Christ, saying: 'I saw him in the flesh after the resurrection, and believe it was he; and when he came to Peter and those who were with Peter, he said unto them: 'Behold, feel me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit.' And immediately they touched him and believed.' "

From the preceding accounts of the Gospel before us and the fragments given, it will be seen—

1. That none of the fathers alluded to saw and used it except Hegesippus, Clement, Origen, Epiphanius, and Jerome. As far as evidence goes, we are justified in excluding Papias, Ignatius, and Eusebius, from the number of those who knew and employed it. It was natural for Hegesippus to use it, because he was a Jewish Christian. Clement, who was not acquainted with Hebrew, may have got his slight notices from those acquainted with it by actual inspection. Origen was not ignorant of Hebrew. It is more than doubtful that a Greek version was current at Alexandria in the time of these fathers, which perished before Jerome made a new one, as some have conjectured. They either saw the Aramaean original themselves, or derived their knowledge of it from such as had seen it. But did Epiphanius possess a Hebrew copy of the Ebionite Gospel; or if he did, was he able to read it? These questions have received different answers. When we consider the place of his birth, his temporary residence in a monastery which he founded in its vicinity, and the localities where the Ebionites had their chief seats; viz. in Palestine and Cyprus, it is certain that he could not have been far from them; as it is also probable that he knew Hebrew. Living, as he did, in the neighbourhood of these Judaising Christians, he could easily procure a copy. Knowing Hebrew, he could read the Aramaean copy, and give numerous quotations from it. That he had nothing more than a Greek translation of it in his hands, or that he speaks solely from information communicated to him by the Ebionites, as Mr. Stuart supposes[r], cannot be made probable.

We are aware that the American professor follows Credner in denying that Epiphanius knew the Ebionite Gospel by personal inspection. But the reasoning of the latter is not satisfactory or

[r] In the American Biblical Repository for 1838, vol. xii. p. 151.

conclusive. It is made up of such points as, that the Ebionites called their document *εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους* or *τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν*, appellations which could not with propriety proceed from them, by way of title or superscription; that Epiphanius adduces the beginning of the Gospel in somewhat different times in two places, as though he did not know the words; and that the same father quotes passages so loosely, as to indicate his ignorance of them as written. But in reply to these allegations, we would remark, that the words of Epiphanius, *καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους*, do not necessarily mean that the Ebionites themselves so called the Gospel; the nominative case to the verb being *ἄνθρωποι*, or some similar noun, *Men* called it, or It is *usually* styled, etc. The same remark will apply to the phrase *Ἑβραϊκὸν δὲ τοῦτο καλοῦσιν*, where a similar nominative belongs to the verb. And even should the proper name *Ebionites* be the nominative, there will be nothing incongruous or improbable in supposing that they themselves styled their Gospel *The Hebrew* Gospel, to distinguish it, by way of excellence, from the Greek document in current use. As to the mode in which Epiphanius quotes it, it need only be assumed that he quoted from memory. The fathers were accustomed to quote the sacred text in that manner. So Epiphanius cited the Greek canonical Gospels; and there was no especial reason why he should adduce the very words of the Ebionite copy. Besides, it is very probable, that different copies of this Gospel differed, not inconsiderably, from one another; since we know that these heretical Christians were not at all scrupulous in dealing with it, nor deterred by sacred awe from introducing corruptions.

In view of the entire case, it would appear that he had a Hebrew copy of the Ebionite Gospel in his hands, and was able to read it. He is said to have been acquainted with five languages; viz. Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, Greek, and Latin, and was thence styled *πενταγλώσσος*.

In regard to Jerome, he both saw and used the Nazarene Gospel, which he translated into Greek and Latin. Probably, however, he was not acquainted with the Ebionite copy; as Epiphanius, on the other hand, was not acquainted with that of the Nazarenes. The manner in which these fathers speak warrants this assertion.

2. On comparing the passages quoted from the Hebrew Gospel by Clement, Origen, and Jerome, with the present Greek canonical Gospel, the discrepancies will be found to consist of mere additions to the text, or of enlargements of what is stated in the text itself. None of the fragments proves that the text of Matthew was curtailed; or that any thing had been subtracted from it. It is true that the interpolations are tasteless and puerile; but this is what might be expected from human supplements to divine revelations. This observation might be illustrated by the character of the interpolations of Codex Bezae, which is a Greek document resembling what the Aramaean Gospel became in the hands of the Nazarenes.

3. The passages quoted by Epiphanius from the Ebionite Gospel, and his own express testimony concerning it, prove that it was Matthew's Gospel curtailed, abridged, and adulterated, as well as enlarged. The Gospel of Luke, in particular, supplied several of its interpolations. The first two chapters were wanting in it; and in one case the Cyprian bishop complains, that the parties who used it altered the sense of a passage, by inserting *μή*, "Have I much desired to eat this passover with you?" (Comp. Matt. xxvi. 17).

But what value did these fathers attach to the Gospel in question? Did they look upon it as authoritative? On this point, the notices of Hegesippus, and Clement of Alexandria, avail nothing. Origen's words, Scriptum est in evangelio *quodam*, quod dicitur secundum Hebraeos, *si tamen placet alicui suscipere illud, non ad auctoritatem, sed ad manifestationem propositae quaestionis*, shew that he was suspicious of its authority; and that he quotes it only by way of illustration or explanation. He hesitated to use it as an authoritative document; though he judged that it might serve "ad manifestationem propositae quaestionis." The same father speaks hesitatingly about it in prefacing the other quotation in his extant writings, *ἐὰν δὲ προσίεταί τις τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον*; "but if any one will receive the Gospel according to the Hebrews," etc.

Eusebius gives nothing by which we might ascertain his own sentiments respecting the Gospel when he affirms, that some placed it among the books called *νόθοι*, *spurious*.

Epiphanius speaks of the Ebionite Gospel as not *πληρέστατον*, but *νενοθευμένον καὶ ἠκρωτηριασμένον*, "not complete, but adulterated and curtailed." In one passage which he quotes, he says, that the Ebionites change the true account into a falsehood, because they read *ἐγκρίδας*, *cakes made with oil and honey*, instead of *ἀκρίδας*, *locusts* (Matt. iii. 4). We have seen also, that he accuses them of having altered the sense of another by inserting *μή*. He had thus an unfavourable opinion of the Ebionites and their Gospel. But he speaks otherwise of the Gospel which the Nazarenes had, asserting that they had it among them *entire*, in the Hebrew language, and expressly identifying it with the Aramaean original; but his testimony on this point is of little value, because he did not see the copy of which he speaks. On the other hand, he was well acquainted with the Ebionite document.

It is very difficult to collect from Jerome's expressions, the estimation in which he held the Gospel before us; because his language regarding it is neither definite nor consistent. In one passage, he says:—"Whoever will believe the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which I lately translated, etc. will not scruple to say," etc. But when we consider that he translated it into Greek and Latin; that he often adduces its readings in a mode indicative of weight attached to them; and that he even identifies it with the original Aramaean of Matthew himself, we seem justified in saying that Jerome valued it very highly, attributing to it a degree of authority proportioned to his conceptions of the extent of alteration it had undergone.

The result of the preceding investigation is, that those fathers who were acquainted with the Hebrew Gospel thought it of some value; although they did not esteem it so highly as to consider it authoritative. They did not reckon it *heretical*, though refusing to look on it as *canonical*. They never objected to it as exhibiting alterations and additions made with the design of promoting *heresy*. Epiphanius undervalued the Ebionite document; but it was somewhat different from the Nazarene. Still, however, the fathers generally, at least Jerome and Epiphanius, identify the Gospel in question with the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, although they did not regard even the Nazarene copy as *canonical*.

4. Why did they not quote it as authoritative and canonical?

Before directly answering this question, it should be distinctly remembered that there were two recensions of it, the Nazarene and the Ebionite, the former much purer and fuller than the latter. They were originally identical, constituting but one document, before the Judaising Christians were split into different sects. When, however, a line of separation was drawn between Nazarenes and Ebionites, the document assumed various aspects in the hands of both. The former made several additions to it, which were probably drawn from early tradition; and possibly they may have occasionally altered the text; the latter modified, abridged, and interpolated it, after their own views and sentiments.

In regard to the character and creed of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, the notices of them found in the fathers are neither consistent nor accurate. Thus much, however, is certain, that some writers gave both appellations to the Jewish Christians generally; while a distinction was made between them by others.

The name *Ebionite* appears as early as Irenaeus, but *Nazarene* is first found in Epiphanius and Jerome. After the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and the subsequent proceedings of Hadrian against the Jews in Palestine, considerable numbers of those Jewish Christians who resided in the neighbourhood of the ruined capital, and of Aelia Capitolina, renounced the observance of the Mosaic law which they had hitherto maintained, and incorporated themselves with the body of the Gentile Christians. By this proceeding, the remaining Hebrew Christians who continued to regard that law as obligatory, stood in an isolated position towards the general body of believers. Thus a difference of opinion existed among Jewish Christians respecting the obligation of the Mosaic law on *Gentiles*. The two dissident parties were called Nazarenes and Ebionites, although both designations are occasionally employed, in an indefinite and loose phraseology, to denote the Hebrew Christians generally. Strictly speaking, they indicate two divisions of the Jewish believers. The Nazarenes, a title which was perhaps originally applied by the Jews to *all* Christians, were such as adhered to the evangelical doctrine of the apostles, differing from other orthodox Christians merely in

the unimportant point of adherence to the ceremonial law, without reckoning the ritual which they themselves observed to be binding on Gentile Christians. On the other hand, the Ebionites maintained the necessity of *all* Christians attending to the Mosaic law, regarded Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary, spoke slightingly of the apostle Paul, and resembled the Gnostics in various particulars.

Now most of the fathers had little acquaintance with these two classes of Christians. Hence the latter were frequently confounded with the former. The more moderate, orthodox, liberal party was not always clearly distinguished from the bigoted and heretical section. Epiphanius is the earliest writer who speaks of the Nazarenes as heretics; but he knew very little of their tenets or gospel. Theodoret relates[s], that Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Origen wrote against them; and that they honoured Christ as a just man; but Justin Martyr[t], speaking of the Judaising Christians in his dialogue with Trypho, says, that he thinks they might be saved. Hence it is apparent that Theodoret did not know the Nazarenes; or that he spoke of *the Ebionites*. When Dr. Burton writes—"There never was a more gratuitous assumption, than that by which the Nazarenes have been identified with the Judaising Christians. That they called themselves Christians, and that they Judaised, is perfectly true: but there is not a particle of evidence that any one of the fathers considered them as orthodox"[u]—he mistakes this point; for neither Augustine, Damascenus, Praedestinatus, nor any credible writer to whom he appeals, adduces against them any thing radically unsound in doctrine. They observed the law of Moses, and therefore remained apart from the Catholic church. This is the sole ground on which the fathers viewed them with suspicion. *In no other sense* were they heretical. When Jerome affirms, that while they wished to be Jews and Christians, they were neither one nor the other[x], he had this unfavourable opinion of them simply because they retained the law of Moses. *Heretics* they were not. In all leading doctrines of the Gospel, their faith was sound like that of the Catholic church. Let any one read Olshausen's investigation of

[s] Haer. Fab. ii. 2.
[t] Dial. cum Trypho, 47.
[u] Bampton Lecture on the Heresies of the Apostolic Age, note 84, pp. 518, 519.
[x] Epist. cxii. 13.

their beliefy, as gathered from the works of the early fathers, and say, whether they were not the genuine descendants and representatives of those Jewish Christians who observed the ancient ritual in the time of the apostles, and whom Paul himself did not think it right to forbid.

The observations now made on the character and creed of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, will furnish a reply to the question, Why did not the fathers quote the Gospel of the Hebrews as canonical and authoritative? It has been shewn, that the teachers of the Catholic church viewed these Jewish Christians with suspicion; though they could not well object to the doctrinal belief of the better portion. They did not regard them as wholly sound, because of their adherence to the Mosaic ritual, but *chiefly* because they remained separate from the Catholic church itself. Hence they were not disposed to receive their Gospel as canonical, whatever they may have thought of its original condition. It was possible that these Hebrew Christians might have changed or corrupted the document; and therefore it could not be quoted as authoritative. Those fathers who had the Nazarene copy in their hands, could hardly look on it in the same light as the canonical Greek Matthew, because they saw that it contained various things not in the latter. They might naturally suppose that it underwent alteration in process of translation, or from the hands of those who used it as their favourite if not exclusive Gospel. It had been interpolated in early times, as we see even from Clement of Alexandria, if not from Ignatius. How then could Clement, Origen, or Jerome, have perfect confidence in it?

In regard to the Ebionite recension, the account of it given by Epiphanius furnishes good reason for the low estimation in which *it* was held.

But a formidable objection to the view we have just given, arises from another appellation belonging to the Nazarene Gospel, viz. the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles. It is alleged, that Jerome identifies the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or the Nazarene document, with that of the Twelve Apostles; and we know that he expressly rejects the latter, pronouncing it a book of the heretics, written by men destitute of the spirit and grace of God. The

y Die Echtheit der vier canon. Evangelien, pp. 29–90.

only authority available for identifying the Gospel of the Nazarenes with that of the Twelve Apostles, is a single passage of Jerome in his dialogues against the Pelagians, where he says: *Secundum apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthaeum.* In the only other passage in which that father refers to it, it is styled *duodecim* apostolorum. In like manner Origen and Ambrose use the adjective *duodecim.* It is therefore doubtful, whether Jerome meant by the Gospel, *quo utuntur Nazareni secundum apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthaeum*, the same document, which elsewhere he himself, as also Origen and Ambrose, call *Evangelium duodecim apostolorum.* Both he and Origen speak in express terms of the spurious, heretical character of the latter; whereas they manifestly attach value to the former. On the whole, the very few and scanty notices we have of the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, cannot justify the conclusion that the Nazarene document was the same under a different title. It is highly probable that the *Ebionite* recension may have been the same.

The question regarding the Hebrew original of Matthew's Gospel is quite independent of that which relates to the Gospel of the Hebrews. The ancient testimony on which the Aramaean original of the first canonical Gospel rests, appears to us good and valid, apart from all consideration of the Nazarene document. It cannot be shewn, that Papias's statement came from the Judaising Christians; or that succeeding fathers rested either on his authority alone, or on the testimony of Hebrew believers, in addition to it. It is true that the fathers generally could not speak from personal knowledge or examination, because the original Aramaean had been early altered. Even those who make use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and do not identify it with the Hebrew Matthew as Origen, assert, notwithstanding, that Matthew wrote in Hebrew for the benefit of his Jewish brethren. It is a gratuitous assumption to say that Origen was deceived in this matter. We admit that he may have relied mainly on tradition; but the tradition may have been true. It is far more probable, when we consider the character of this father, that the tradition on which he rested was *true.* The advocates of a Greek original speak lightly of report and tradition, as though these things were uniformly incorrect. And when they attempt, with

Hug, to trace the tradition in question to the Jewish Christians, their proof fails.

Let us now pause to consider this account of the original Gospel of Matthew. It runs through all antiquity. None doubted of its truth, as far as we can judge from their writings. There is not the least trace of an opposite tradition. Matthew wrote in Palestine; and all the fathers who record the traditional information respecting his Hebrew Gospel, resided for a longer or shorter period in the very country where the book was written, with the exception of Papias and Irenaeus. Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and Epiphanius, spent some time in the birth-place of the first Gospel. Is it not, therefore, strange, that they should have found no trace of the fact that Matthew wrote in Greek, not in Hebrew? Could all vestiges of the truth have thus disappeared in Palestine? Was it not the interest of the Catholic Christians to preserve and cherish the tradition of a Greek original, since they adopted the Greek Gospel alone as canonical? When we consider, that the true original was in the hands of sectaries, such as the Nazarenes and Ebionites, though it had been disfigured by additions; and that the voice of tradition, as reported by the orthodox fathers, spoke in favour of the Aramaean, does it not seem unaccountable, that the orthodox Christians should never have adduced the hypothesis of a Greek, instead of an Aramaean original, had that hypothesis been founded in fact? Surely all their feelings would have induced them not to allow the true account to disappear out of Palestine utterly, so that they could not even venture to hint at the possibility of a Greek, instead of an Aramaean original.

In addition to the evidence of antiquity in favour of a Hebrew original, we may adduce other arguments to the same effect, drawn from —

1. The persons for whose use it was written.

The prevalence of the Greek language in Palestine has been largely insisted on by Hug and others, as an argument for the Greek original. But, when it is remembered, that the Gospel was written for the Jews in Palestine, a fact expressly attested by ancient writers, and confirmed by its internal character, it will be found that the currency of Greek in Judaea is not decisive of the

question. If it could be shewn, that the Greek had *entirely supplanted* Syro-Chaldaic, or that the Jews at least preferred it, then indeed it might be concluded, that a Greek Gospel alone was written by Matthew for the use of his countrymen; but as long as *neither* prevailed exclusively in the land, there is room for hesitation in arriving at that conclusion.

(*a*) The first circumstance to be remarked in relation to the question before us is, the peculiar tenacity of the Jewish nation. Although brought under the yoke of the Greeks, like other Asiatic nations, their religion and history furnished them with peculiar motives for abiding by their ancient language. They could not be induced to part with it as readily as the heathen who had no knowledge of the true God. The force of necessity might oblige them to learn the dialect of their conquerors; but all the feelings of their nature, among which ancestral pride was not the least powerful, and the associations to which they clung all the more closely in adversity, led them to adhere to their own loved language.

(*b*) The case of Josephus, writing the history of his countrymen, is applicable to the present subject. According to his statement, no Jew had made so great progress in the Greek language as himself, although he had not attained to accuracy in pronouncing it. *Λέγω δὲ θαρσήσας — ὅτι μηδεὶς ἂν ἕτερος ἡδυνήθη θελήσας, μήτε Ἰουδαῖος, μήτε ἀλλόφυλος, τὴν πραγματείαν ταύτην οὕτως ἀκριβῶς εἰς Ἕλληνας ἐξενεγκεῖν· ἐγὼ γὰρ ὡμολογούμην παρὰ τῶν ὁμοεθνῶν πλεῖστον αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐπιχώριον παιδείαν διαφέρειν· καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν δὲ γραμμάτων ἐσπούδασα μετασχεῖν, τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἀναλαβὼν, τὴν δὲ περὶ τὴν προφορὰν ἀκρίβειαν πάτριος ἐκώλυσε συνήθεια. Παρ' ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἐκείνους ἀποδέχονται τοὺς πολλῶν ἐθνῶν διάλεκτον ἐκμαθόντας καὶ γλαφυρότητι λέξεων τὸν λόγον ἐπικομψεύοντας, διὰ τὸ κοινὸν εἶναι νομίζειν τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα τοῦτο οὐκ ἐλευθέρων μόνον τοῖς τυχοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν τοῖς θέλουσιν. μόνοις δὲ σοφίαν μαρτυροῦσι τοῖς τὰ νόμιμα σαφῶς ἐπισταμένοις καὶ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων δύναμιν ἑρμηνεῦσαι δυναμένοις*[z]. "And I am so bold as to say, that no other person, whether Jew or foreigner, had he ever so great a desire, could so accurately deliver these accounts to the Greeks; for those of my own nation freely acknowledge, that I far exceed them in the education of my

[z] Antiq. Jud. xx. 11. 2.

country. I have also been anxious to obtain the learning of the Greeks, having learned the elements of grammar, though I have been so long accustomed to our own tongue, that I cannot pronounce Greek with accuracy. For with us those who have learned foreign languages are not at all esteemed, because this is considered as an employment common to the lower class of freemen and of slaves. They alone are regarded as wise, who are accurately acquainted with the precepts of the law, and are able to interpret the Holy Scriptures." These words imply, that the Jews of Palestine were more accustomed to another language than the Greek; else the writer would hardly have singled himself out as the only person competent to write in Greek about Jewish antiquities.

(*c*) Besides he wrote the history of the Jewish war at first in Hebrew: *Προύθεμην ἐγὼ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν, Ἕλλάδι γλώσσῃ μεταβαλὼν, ἃ τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρότερον, ἀφηγήσασθαι*[a]. "I purposed," says he, "to narrate in the Greek language to those under the Roman dominion, the things which I formerly composed for the barbarians of the interior, in my native tongue." In translating this history into Greek for the use of Greeks and Romans, he employed the aid of several assistants. The expression *τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ* indicates the vernacular and national tongue, which could not have been the same as *Ἕλλάδι γλώσσῃ*.

(*d*) But there are often circumstances connected with the Jewish historian that bear on the present question. By command of Titus he spoke to the Jewish army from a convenient position, declaring the message of the emperor in Hebrew. "Josephus, as if he came not to John alone, but also to the multitude, standing where he could be heard, declared the message of the emperor in Hebrew[b]." The watchmen on the towers also appear to have spoken Aramaean; for, when they witnessed the discharge from the engines against the walls, they raised a cry in the language of the country, *τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ*[c]. Surely this could not have been Greek.

(*e*) The same historian designates the Greek a 'foreign language,' *ξένη διάλεκτος*, while he speaks of the Babylonian or Aramaean in a manner sufficiently indicating it to be a living

[a] Bell. Jud. Prooem. 1. [b] Ibid. vi. 2. 1. [c] Ibid. v. 6. 3.

tongue, when he says: "Moses called it *Abnet;* but we, instructed by the Babylonians, call it *Emian;* for so it is named by them [d]."

(*f*) Two passages in the New Testament bear upon the point before us. In Acts i. 19. a peculiar dialect or tongue is said to characterise Jerusalem, and consequently the country of which it was the capital. The term which Luke adduces from this dialect is Aramaean, shewing the prevalent language.

When the people at Jerusalem had been excited against Paul, he addressed them in the Hebrew dialect [τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ, Acts xxi. 40. xxii. 2.], i. e. the Aramaean, to which they listened attentively, and by means of which he calmed their fury. This proves that they were familiar with and strongly attached to it.

(*g*) Again, we have Jerome's testimony for the fact, that Syriac or Syro-Chaldaic was not extinct in Palestine in the fourth century. Speaking of a Frank who was possessed, he says:—"Videres de ore barbaro, et qui Francam tantum et Latinam linguam noverat, *Syra* ad purum *verba* resonare: ut non *stridor*, non *aspiratio*, non *idioma* aliquod *Palaestini* deesset *eloquii* [e]."

(*h*) The church in Palestine, when Matthew wrote, consisted for the most part of native Jews, to whom were added Jews of the dispersion who had come to the feasts at Jerusalem, and been converted there. The Gospel had not been preached extensively even to the latter. And can we doubt the strength of the Jewish prejudices generally, when the Gospel was composed? The people were zealous for the law. They would scarcely have listened with patience to the Gospel in any other language than that which was substantially the language of the law.

(*i*) In addition to the preceding remarks it must be remembered, that the Septuagint version was never read by the Jews in their synagogues in Palestine in place of the ancient Hebrew. Copies of this version were frequently kept in synagogues for the use of the interpreter, but no more. It is true that the contrary has been asserted by several writers; but the authorities to which they appeal do not warrant their conclusion, as has been ably proved by Frankel [f].

(*k*) These arguments might be increased by others equally

[d] Antiqq. iii. 7. 2.
[e] In vita Hilarionis.
[f] Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta, §8, p. 56, et seqq.

direct or forcible. Thus the existence and origin of Targums, before or about the time of Christ's advent, imply that the people understood no language so well as the Aramaean.

(*a*) We rest chiefly on the circumstance, that Josephus terms the Syro-Chaldaic πάτριος γλώσση, as contrasted with the Greek, to which latter he applies the appellation ξένη καὶ ἀλλοδαπὴ διάλεκτος. Which, then, of these two, would Matthew, writing to his countrymen in Palestine, naturally choose? Even supposing the natives of Palestine to have been as familiar with Greek as with Hebrew, would he have preferred the foreign dialect to that which they learned from their infancy, and which was best fitted to procure a favourable hearing? We are far from denying that the Greek language prevailed to a great extent in Palestine, in the age of Christ and his apostles. But there is abundant evidence to shew, that Aramaean prevailed at the same time, and as we believe to a greater extent; that it was the national language to which the Jews were accustomed from their earliest years, and which they naturally liked the best. When therefore it is considered, that Matthew, as a Jew, wrote a Gospel for the use of his Jewish brethren in Palestine, it is reasonable to conclude, that he would employ the language for which they had a predilection.

But all the circumstances favourable to the Hebrew original of Matthew's Gospel have been deemed insufficient proof. Dominic Diodati[g], and Hug, to mention no more, have endeavoured to turn aside the force of the entire argument with great skill and ingenuity. It is therefore incumbent on the impartial inquirer to look at the state of the question in the light of their remarks.

(*b*). The passage from Josephus, already quoted under this head, has been interpreted by Diodati, of the historian's aim and ability to render his Jewish Antiquities into pure or classical Greek. Although Josephus was accustomed to the use of a Greek language, it was Hebraised and barbarous Greek. Besides, he did not know the language grammatically; and therefore he was obliged to study it, and to endeavour to attain to accuracy in writing and pronouncing it. So Diodati reasons. But the expression, πάτριος ἐκώλυσε συνήθεια, viewed in the light of the

[g] De Christo Graece loquente, p. 152, et seqq.—Dobbin's reprint.

context, clearly points to familiarity with a native language very different from the Greek. Had Josephus spoken the Greek from his infancy, even in the Hellenistic dialect, we can hardly conceive of the exceeding difficulty he found in acquiring and pronouncing the Greek then current. The difference between the same language would not have been so great as to have caused the formidable impediment of which he speaks. We must therefore refer *πάτριος ἐκώλυσε συνήθεια* to the habit of speaking another language than Greek—to a native, national tongue, confined to Josephus and his countrymen. This view is confirmed by the use of *πάτριος*, in the proem to the History of the Jewish War, where *πάτριος γλώσσα* is contrasted with *Ἑλλὰς γλώσσα*.

(*c*) The force of this passage is turned aside, by referring *τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν* to *the Jews* under the Roman dominion, including the Palestinian Jews. But this ellipsis is unnatural. It was certainly for others in the Roman empire, rather than his own countrymen, that he composed a history of the Jewish War. The simplest ellipsis would be *βαρβάροις*, taken from *τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις*[h]. The contrast between *τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ*, and *Ἑλλάδι γλώσσῃ*, is adverse to the idea of the one being *Hellenistic*, and the other *classical* Greek. Both these were *substantially* the same language. The propriety of the language and purpose of Josephus is apparent, on the supposition that *πάτριος γλώσσα* refers to a language quite distinct from *Ἑλλὰς γλώσσα*; but there is a want of congruity on any other assumption.

(*d*) Hug is inclined to believe, that Aramaean was chosen on this occasion, because there existed "in the old ancestorial sound a token of like extraction, and of like interest, in the fate of the native land," on which account it possessed an inducement to confidence. If this be applied to the case of Matthew, a Jew writing to the Jews in Palestine, the presumption in favour of Aramaean is strong. The tones of a language which would naturally vibrate to their hearts, would be chosen in preference to those of an acquired and foreign tongue.

(*e*) *Ξένη διάλεκτος*, according to Diodati, has been confounded with *ξενὴ γλώσσα*. The former, in his opinion, denotes that

[h] See note II. at end of volume.

dialect of Greek now usually termed *Hellenistic*, differing from pure Greek by its intermixture of foreign terms and of solecisms. It is quite true that Josephus uses διάλεκτος, not γλώσση, in the passage; but it is very doubtful whether he meant to discriminate between them. The usage of both leads us to infer that he employed them interchangeably. Thus in Antiq. xx. 11. 2, πολλῶν ἐθνῶν διάλεκτον means the language or languages of many nations. In the Preface to the History of the Jewish War, τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ is used, not διαλέκτῳ, although, according to Diodati's own interpretation of the phrase, as contrasted with Ἑλλάδι γλώσσῃ, consistency requires τῇ πατρίῳ διαλέκτῳ. It follows, therefore, that Josephus employed both nouns indiscriminately.

(*f*) The opinion of Diodati, that τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ means ancient Hebrew, which the people who listened to Paul did not at all understand, though they allowed him to proceed for a time in his address, is so preposterous as to require no remark. Hug candidly admits, that the passage implies, on the part of the auditors, a predilection for *the language of the country*—that although they could have listened to the Greek, they delighted in the Hebrew instead of it. This admission is quite to our purpose. If the natives of Palestine had a predilection for *the language of the country*, i.e. the Aramaean, it is not probable that Matthew would choose to write to them in a language for which they had less predilection.

Hug and others have relied much on the fact of numerous Ἑλληνισταὶ being found in the Church of Jerusalem (Acts vi. 1), so numerous as to maintain a dispute with the Jews. These Hellenists, as he affirms, were Greek-speaking Jews, as opposed to Ἑβραῖοι, Jews speaking Hebrew or Aramaean. Hence it is inferred, that Greek, *as the language of the Jews in Palestine*, prevailed along with Aramaean. But it is evident that the Ἑβραῖοι were the more numerous and influential party in the church, so that, even according to Hug's reasoning, more spoke Aramaean than Greek. The term Ἑλληνιστὴς occurs but twice in the New Testament, viz., in Acts vi., 1, and ix., 29; for in Acts xi., 20, Ἕλληνας is the right reading. The word bears a signification somewhat specific, denoting a Jew living among Greeks, and

speaking the Greek language, or in other words, a Jew of the dispersion (εἰς τὴν διασποράν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, Joh. vii. 35). There can be little doubt that this is its true sense in Acts ix. 29. It would appear from Acts vi. 1, that the name continued to be given to the Jews who came from Greek-speaking countries, even after they had embraced Christianity. If, therefore, the name of Hellenist still adhered to them after changing their religion and residence—if it was still given to such as had been Jews of the dispersion, but who were now incorporated in the Church of Jerusalem, mainly composed of native Jews, it need not be urged that they necessarily retained the language they had formerly spoken. They may probably have still used it, but they would soon learn to understand the native language of Palestine, if it were merely the primitive Hebrew degenerated. The contrast in Acts vi. 1, certainly marks a difference of country and language between the Hellenists and Hebrews; but the former are characterised as Jews of the dispersion in regard to their state *before* they became incorporated with the Church of Jerusalem. The appellation is not at all conclusive respecting their use of the Greek language after they had become Christians at Jerusalem; much less is it demonstrative of the fact that the Jews in Palestine were accustomed to speak Greek. Rather does the term *Hebrews* in the passage show that the native Jews spoke another language than that of the Hellenists.

2. The Hebraisms of the first Gospel are favourable to the hypothesis of its Hebrew original. It must however be admitted, that the *Hebraising* of the apostle has been exaggerated by Bolten[j]. Nor are Eichhorn's[k] and Bertholdt's[l] reasonings free from the same fault. When these writers adduce mistakes committed by the Greek translator, or cases in which he failed to render the original perspicuously and accurately, it may be proved that they generally assign incorrect significations, or such at least as cannot be substantiated. The Hebraisms in Matthew are more strongly marked than those found in the other Gospels. With all their resemblance to the Hebraistic peculiarities of Mark and Luke, they occasionally

[j] Der Bericht des Matthaeus von Jesu dem Messia. Altona, 8vo. 1792.
[k] Einleit. in das Neue Testament. vol. i.
[l] Historisch-Kritische Einleitung, third part.

present an aspect indicative of a Hebrew original from which they were translated. Thus *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, a phrase of frequent occurrence in Matthew, has no parallel in the New Testament. The use of the article also in the genealogy, to which Middleton[m] has directed attention, tends to the same conclusion. Greek usage would require the introduction of the article on the repetition of each proper name; whereas the reverse is there found. Hence that word has been thought to represent the Chaldee particle יָת as the Seventy occasionally render the sign of the accusative case.

3. The mode of quotation may also be urged on the same side of the question. We are aware that the advocates of a Greek original also reason from the quotations in favour of their hypothesis. So Heidegger, in the seventeenth century, asserted that the Greek Matthew follows the Seventy in most passages taken from the Old Testament; while Hug reasons from the citations in favour of a like conclusion. Eichhorn's statement, that there is no trace of the use of the Septuagint, is certainly extreme. It cannot be denied, that many quotations very nearly coincide with the Greek version. But yet there are many agreeing with the Hebrew text; especially the Messianic passages. From a careful collation it appears, that no Messianic place has been cited after the Septuagint. The original Hebrew is the source from which each one has been drawn. Jerome asserts, that the evangelist has everywhere followed the original in the Old Testament, a statement which the present Greek Gospel does not bear out. The expression must either be an exaggeration, or its explanation be found in the fact, that Matthew wrote in the Aramaean language. In a question like that before us, this father was a very competent judge, and would not be prone to fall into rash or hasty utterances. It is more probable, therefore, that it proceeds on the assumption of the Gospel being written in another tongue than Greek. Besides, there is no small difficulty in accounting for the expression *εἰς νῖκος* (xii. 20) the representative of לַאֱמֶת on any other ground than that taken by Maldonatus[n] and Bolten, who take it to be rendered from the Syro-chaldaic

[m] The Doctrine of the Greek article, etc. Rose's edition, p. 124.
[n] Comment. in loc.

ܠܙܟܘܠܐ, a word which signifies not only *truth* or *righteousness*, but *victory* also. The Greek translator chose the latter signification, which does not precisely accord with the Hebrew. In short, the number of quotations taken from the original by Matthew, and especially the introductory formulas by which they are often prefaced, agree best with the hypothesis of an Aramaean original. Perhaps the majority of the citations coinciding with the Seventy should be assigned in their present form to the Greek translator, agreeably to Jerome's opinion.

4. Michaelis adduces another argument founded on the preface of Luke's Gospel, in which he thinks an indirect censure is cast on the Gospels written before his own. Matthew's must therefore have been unknown to Luke, a thing which could not have happened had it previously existed in Greek. Hence it must have been composed in Hebrew. This argument is of force only on the supposition that Matthew wrote previously to Luke; and that ἐπεχείρησαν really implies some degree of censure, as Origen, Michaelis, and others believe. We do not adduce this reason in favour of a Hebrew Gospel as of much weight. But although somewhat precarious, it appears deserving of mention.

The author of the Greek translation was not Matthew himself. No early writer ever thought of ascribing it to him. The person from whom it proceeded is unknown. Various authors it is true have been mentioned by the fathers, such as James and John; the former, by the author of the Synopsis Sacrae Scripturae in Athanasius's works; the latter, by Theophylact; while Anastasius Sinaita affirms that Luke and Paul translated it into Greek. But it is apparent from the discordant opinions, that the ancients knew nothing of the person. Jerome writes—"Quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est." This is the true account of the matter: and if Jerome professed his ignorance on the point, Theophylact and others should have followed his example, instead of indulging in fruitless conjectures.

The interval of time between the composition of the original and the version was perhaps considerable. If the expression *unto this day*, in xxvii. 8, and xxviii. 15, proceeded, as we believe, from the translator, it intimates more than a very short space. Twenty years seem to be required by it.

With regard to *the relation* between the Aramaean and the Greek there must be great uncertainty, as long as the former does not exist. That the relation was intimate can scarcely be doubted, else the Greek could not have been uniformly referred to Matthew. In the present version we have Matthew's genuine production. It may be questioned indeed whether it be in all respects *an exact representative* of the original. Probably additions were made by the translator. His work was intended for a wider sphere of readers than the Hebrew. He meant to adapt it, in some measure, to Gentile as well as Jewish readers. The converts from Judaism were addressed in the first instance; but the sacred production was written for all classes, and therefore it was rendered into Greek. In the providence of God it was destined to teach Jew and Gentile till the end of the world. The special purpose for which it was originally designed did not exclude a wider and more general object, such as the Gospel in another language was fitted to subserve. It must be allowed that the point before us is extremely delicate. There is no historical proof of changes or additions made by the translator. Any conclusion, therefore, to which a modern writer comes in regard to it, depends largely on subjective feeling. It rests on the doctrinal position he has previously taken. Some will be inclined to assume very considerable differences between the Aramaean and the Greek; others will be reluctant to allow any except slight and immaterial deviations. It is far safer and wiser to take the latter course. We believe that the translator subjoined the explanations of Hebrew words occurring in ch. i. 23: "They shall call his name Immanuel, *which is, being interpreted, God with us*" (xxvii. 46): "Eli, Eli, lama sabacthani, *that is to say, My God, my God! why hast thou forsaken me?*" (xxvii. 33): "They came to a place called Golgotha, *that is to say, a place of a skull.*" So also xxvii. 15: "*Now at that feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would*" (xxviii. 15): "And this saying is commonly reported among the Jews, *until this day*" (xxvii. 8): "Wherefore that field was called, *the field of blood, unto this day.*" "The same day came to him the Sadducees, *which say that there is no resurrection*, and asked him" (xxii. 23). These explanatory phrases accord with the purpose which originated

a Greek version of the Gospel, and are inappropriate to natives of Palestine. They show an express reference to the case of Greek readers unacquainted with the Hebrew language and the customs of Palestine at the time in question. We are aware that Michaelis, Bolten, Eichhorn, and Bertholdt maintain, that the translator mistook the sense of his author in several instances, as also that he took great liberties and latitude. But in that case, it is difficult to account for the circumstance of the Greek Gospel being always assigned to Matthew, and quoted as his by the early Christian writers. The relation of the Greek to the Hebrew must have been very close, else the one would not have superseded the other so readily and rapidly before the eyes of the primitive Christians. Had they entertained suspicions of corruption, or of mistakes committed by the translator, they would not easily have allowed the original to pass into oblivion. They used the Greek in preference to the Hebrew, not only as being understood by a larger circle of readers, but as presenting *substantially* the authentic Gospel of Matthew the apostle. The manner in which they employed it evinces their absolute confidence in its authority. Thus the fact of the author being unknown does not *really* militate against the canonical position of the Greek Gospel. Whoever he was, whether an apostle, or a disciple of the apostles, he must have written under infallible guidance. The value assigned to his version by the primitive believers, the manner in which it was always quoted as a part of Scripture, the divine origin ascribed to it, the general confidence in its integrity and faithfulness, are circumstances in the early history of Christianity which unite to strengthen our conviction of *the virtual* inspiration possessed by the writer to whom we owe the present Greek Gospel.

Many arguments have been adduced against a Hebrew original. Most of those, however, which we find in the older writers proceed on *a priori* views of the divine conduct and the nature of inspiration. The strongest may be reduced to four.

(*a*) The old Syriac version was made from the Greek, not the Hebrew. On this argument great stress has been laid by Hug, and after him by Professor Stuart. "Here, then," says the latter, "we have a version, the Peshito, of a very early age, in a

language which was twin-sister to the Hebrew of the day, yea almost identical with it in a multitude of respects; and yet this version is demonstrably made, not from a *Hebrew* original of Matthew, but from the present Greek canonical Matthew! Could it enter the imagination of any Syriac translator, that a *Greek* copy, on any account, either as to authority or language, was preferable to a genuine Hebrew one, supposing such an one to be current? It is almost absurd to suppose it. The business of translating into Syriac was more than three quarters done to hand, when a Syro-Chaldaic original of Matthew was obtained. All was plain, obvious, easy. But a Greek original demanded much care, and not a little skill. That skill has, indeed, been exhibited fully; a noble version the Peshito is, truly; but then the time and pains it must have cost were wasted, in case an original Syro-Chaldaic Matthew could have been obtained. Could it not be, if it were extant and current among Jewish Christians? Most certainly it could[o]."

The force of this reasoning will be weakened, if not entirely removed, when we attend to the direction in which Christianity travelled towards Syria. The Acts of the Apostles shew that the religion of Jesus was early established at Antioch. From this city Barnabas and Saul were sent forth as missionaries; and there can be little doubt, that the persons who first preached Christ in Eastern Syria, belonged to the same place. Hence the inhabitants of the country would naturally receive copies of the apostolic writings from that locality, especially as several of the epistles were addressed to the believers in cities not very remote. All the circumstances connected with Antioch, to say nothing of those which affected the destiny of the Hebrew Gospel, and prevented its circulation beyond the confines of Palestine till after the Greek edition had become current, make it probable that the believers there received the Greek copy. Indeed, it may be questioned whether they knew of any other. If no other was known or circulated at Antioch, Edessa would neither know nor care for the Hebrew. As long as the inhabitants of the latter place received the Greek Gospel as of canonical authority, they would scarcely inquire about a Syro-Chaldaic original. The

[o] Biblical Repos. vol. xii. pp. 166, 167.

single element of *time* is sufficient to annihilate the force of the objection; for if the Peshito was not made till many years after the appearance of the Hebrew, when the orthodox had no confidence in the Nazarenes, and the Greek had all but supplanted it, there is no difficulty in the simple fact of the Greek copy being made the basis of the Syriac version[p].

These observations procced on the assumption, that Christianity was not carried directly from Palestine into the north-eastern parts of Syria, as is implied in the fabulous story relative to King Abgarus and the mission of Thaddeus the apostle, in which case the Aramaean might have been taken immediately into the country. There are few critics of the present day who do not look upon that account as apocryphal.

(*b*) It is said, that there are no characteristics of a translation in the Greek. "Nullum certe in nostro Matthaeo reperitur indicium, unde colligi possit, ex alia in aliam linguam fuisse conversum; plurima vero aliud suadent," writes Wetstein[q]. This is merely a proof of its excellence. It bears the marks of an original. The author was so fully competent to his task, as to produce a version having all the appearance and character of an original. The translation is free. The unknown individual appears not to have adhered slavishly or literally to the document before him. He cast it into the mould of another language, retaining the spirit and force of the original. Had it been *a literal* translation, it is almost impossible to conceive of the want of some marks, at least, of a version. If it faithfully adhered to *the letter* of the original, there would have been indications of a translation. But the author not only exercised his own mind on two languages, but also on the entire substance and contents of the Hebrew Gospel. In this way he may be said to have been, *to some extent*, an independent author, as well as a translator. Still, however, he was under infallible guidance. He could not err. He had nothing to correct, nothing to alter essentially. The Gospel passing through his hands was always Matthew's Gospel.

(*c*) Paronomasias occur in the Greek Gospel. This fact is neutralised by the circumstance, that paronomasias are also found in the Septuagint. Examples might be given from the Greek

[p] See Note iii. at the end of the volume. [q] (Note) Nov. Test. Graec. vol. i. p. 224.

version of Daniel belonging to that ancient translation of the Seventy.

(*d*) The *Greek* Gospel alone is quoted or referred to by the early fathers. None of them appeals to the Hebrew document, which, supposing it to have existed, the early Christians must have unaccountably neglected. If we reflect on the fortunes of the Jewish Christians in Palestine till the time of Hadrian, we shall not be surprised at the paucity of copies which must necessarily have been made, nor the neglect on the part of the Gentile Christians of a Gospel which they were unable to read. For some time, the original could not have been circulated much, if at all, beyond Palestine, or even beyond the capital; and must therefore have been confined to the small community of believers for whose use it was originally composed.

Some advocate the hypothesis of a twofold Gospel by Matthew, the one in Aramaean, the other in Greek; or a double publication of the one Gospel, in two languages. This idea suggested itself long ago to Schwarz[r] and Bengelius[s]. Guerike[t], in his Beiträge, revived it; and Schott[u], appeared to look on it with some degree of favour, as far as his language allows us to conjecture. So also Olshausen, in the Introduction to his Commentary on the Gospels. It was reserved for Thiersch[x] to discover evidence of it in antiquity, even in the words of Papias, which have, indeed, a fragmentary appearance. Translating ἡρμήνευσε by the pluperfect, he supplies the ellipsis thus: "Till he himself published the Greek copy, which is read throughout the whole church as his Gospel." Here is an arbitrary assumption drawn from the air. The speculation of Orelli[y] is somewhat similar, but peculiar. It represents two disciples of Matthew committing to writing the evangelical tradition which they received from him, the one in Aramaean, the other in Greek, for the use of the Jewish Christians. In our own country, the hypothesis has been adopted by Townson, Whitby,[z] Benson[a], Hales, Bloomfield, and others.

[r] Soloecismi discipulorum Jesu Christi, etc. p. 49.
[s] Gnomon Novi Testamenti, p. 2. second edition.
[t] Beiträge zur histor kritisch. Einleit. ins N. T. p. 36, et seqq.
[u] Isagoge historico-critica in libros novi foederis Sacros. p. 69.
[x] Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunkts, etc. p. 193.
[y] Selecta Patrum Ecclesiae Capita, p. 10.
[z] Preface to St. Matthew's Gospel, in his Commentary on the N. T.
[a] History of the First Planting of the Christian Religion, vol. i. p. 257.

But it is easy to perceive its gratuitous character. It is a clumsy expedient, devised for the purpose of uniting two conflicting opinions—for saving the credit of ancient testimony which is on the side of a Hebrew original, and of meeting, at the same time, the difficulties supposed to arise from the early circulation of the Greek. If these authors be desirous to abide by the testimony of antiquity, why do they assume that Matthew himself was the translator? Does not the fact, that the fathers never suspected the apostle himself of producing the Greek Gospel, prove that it was universally believed not to have proceeded from him. They who followed the prevalent tradition, conjectured that the Greek copy proceeded from John, or James, or Luke, or Paul; but never dreamed of ascribing it to the apostle himself. Thus the advocates of the double hypothesis go in the face of ancient testimony. Besides, they believe that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, for the use of Jewish converts. Do they also suppose his Greek Gospel to have been intended for the same class? If so, the latter was plainly unnecessary: one Gospel was sufficient for the same persons. Or do they believe that the second edition of it was designed for Gentile Christians? If so, the notion is contradicted by internal evidence, which proves that it was written specially for Jews. In short, the hypothesis is wholly untenable, and we are surprised that it should have found so many advocates.

IV. Characteristic Peculiarities.

Under this head we propose to notice the manner in which events and discourses are narrated, characteristics of language and style, and the use of the Old Testament.

(*a*) Mode of narration. St. Matthew's object was doctrinal rather than historical. It was natural, therefore, that he should pursue a plan unlike that of the proper historian, as Xenophon does in his Memorabilia of Socrates. His Gospel, accordingly, is not strictly regular. Events and circumstances are not narrated in their natural order. Chronological succession is not observed. In pursuing his main purpose, the writer brings together facts separated by intervals of time. He has occasionally grouped together discourses and parables of our Lord, relating them consecutively, as if they had been uttered in a continuous series.

This principle of classification, by virtue of which occurrences and discourses chronologically separated are connected, is usually founded on sameness of locality. Time and place appear to have been subordinate considerations in the mind of the apostle. Hence he does not present a chronological biography, much less does he enter into details, except in recording the sayings of Jesus. Intent on setting forth Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah promised in the Old Testament, he has grouped, in a well-defined outline, such facts and teachings connected with His person as were suited to the purpose, linking them by means of some associating principle. Every good harmony will shew how he departed from the strict order of time. Such is the view that appears to us the only correct one. It coincides with the opinion of Hug, Feilmoser,[b] Olshausen, and Greswell[c]. The old theory was the very opposite. In modern times, Eichhorn revived and endeavoured to establish it, by proving the chronological character of the Gospel. He has been followed by Marsh, Kaiser[d], Scheckenburger[e], De Wette[f], and others. These writers commonly appeal to the beginnings of sections, with their particles indicative of time. Thus De Wette adduces the following:—

The beginnings of sections:—iii. 1-12. *ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις.*—iii. 13-17. *τότε.*—iv. 1-11. *τότε.*—iv. 12-17. *ἀκούσας δὲ* . . . . . comp. v. 17. *ἀπὸ τότε.*—iv. 18-22. *περιπατῶν δὲ* . . . . iv. 23—vii. 29. *καὶ περιῆγεν* . . . . . comp. v. 1. *ἰδὼν δὲ* . . . . . —viii. 1-4. *καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους.*—viii. 5-15. *εἰσελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ εἰς Καπερναούμ.*—viii. 14-17. *καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου.*—viii. 18-27. *ἰδὼν δὲ* . . . . . *πολλοὺς ὄχλους περὶ αὐτόν.*—viii. 28-34. *καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πέραν.*—ix. 1-18. *καὶ* . . . . . *διεπέρασε καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν.*—ix. 9-11. *καὶ παράγων* . . . . . *ἐκεῖθεν.*—ix. 18-26. *ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος.*—ix. 27-34. *καὶ παράγοντι ἐκεῖθεν.*—x. 1-42. *καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος* (comp. ix. 37. *τότε*).—xi. 1-30. *καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσσων τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς, μετέβη ἐκεῖθεν*, 2, *ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἀκούσας.*—xii. 1-18. *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ.*

[b] Einleitung in die Bücher des neuen Bundes, p. 27, et seqq.
[c] Dissertations upon the Principles and Arrangement of a Harmony of the Gospels, vol. i. pp. 4, 194, et seqq.
[d] Ueber die synopt. Zusammenstellung der vier kanonischen Evangelien, p. 38.
[e] Beiträge zur Einleit. ins N. T. p. 25, et seqq.
[f] Einleitung, vierte Auflage, p. 151.

—xii. 9-14. *καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν.*—xii. 15-21. . . . . *ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν.*—xii. 22-45. *τότε.*—38. *τότε.*—xii. 46-50. *ἔτι δὲ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος.*—xiii. 1-52. *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ.*—xiii. 53-58. *καὶ . . . . . μετῆρεν ἐκεῖθεν.*—xiv. 1-12. *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ.*—xiv. 13-21. *καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν.*—xiv. 22-36. *καὶ εὐθέως.*—xv. 1-20. *τότε.*—xv. 21-28. *καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐκεῖθεν.*—xv. 29-39. *καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν.*—xvi. 1-12. *καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι . . . . . .* comp. xv. 39. . . . . *καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια Μαγδαλά.*—xvi. 13-28. *ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας.*—xvii. 1-13. *καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ.*—xvii. 14-21. *καὶ ἐλθόντων αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον.*—xvii. 22. *ἀναστρεφομένων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ.*—xvii. 24-27. *ἐλθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς Καπερναούμ.*—xviii. 1-35. *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ.*

In like manner, Scheckenburger adduces the use of *τότε* in various passages of Matthew, of *ἀπὸ τότε*, of the particles *ἰδού*, *δέ*, *καί*, with the remark, that the three last have often a participle, indicating strict succession. He also refers to the definite acceptation of *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ* in chapters xiii. 1; xxii. 23.

But such notices of time are indefinite. They rather serve as connecting links in the narrative, than as strictly chronological marks. They constitute dates more or less specific; but do not prove chronological arrangement. In one case, Matthew has *μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ*, which is properly chronological, and sufficiently distinct; but such cases are extremely rare. We do not deny that the particles or modes of expression in question may stand where chronological accuracy is observed; but we affirm that they are not *of themselves* demonstrative of such arrangement. The connexion may indicate, that where they stand, the writer narrates in regular order of time; but, on the other hand, the connexion may afford no indication to that effect, and we are at liberty to suppose, *as far as these words are concerned*, that the natural order has been departed from. *Taken by themselves*, they cannot be regarded as proving chronological arrangement. They must be viewed along with the particular connexion in which they stand; and when so viewed, they are capable of being understood *definitely* or *indefinitely*.

We do not affirm that Matthew's Gospel is always irregular, nor even the greater part of it. A considerable portion of it

appears, from a comparison with the Gospels of Mark and Luke, to stand in proper order, agreeably to the natural consecution of events. But the writer had an important object in view, which could not be accomplished in the best manner by confining himself throughout to the regular series of succession. He has therefore neglected chronological arrangement in various places. Hence his Gospel should not be made the basis of a harmony, as is done by Kaiser. Mark and Luke should not be brought into rigid conformity with Matthew, else violence will be done them.

But it is argued by Marsh, that Matthew "being an apostle and eye-witness of the facts he has recorded, must in general have known the time in which each of them happened, but which St. Mark and St. Luke, who were not eye-witnesses, could not always know[g]." In answer to this it may be remarked, that chronological arrangement may not have been of so much importance in the eyes of Matthew as to induce him to follow it, when the chief purpose for which he wrote might be better fulfilled by neglecting it. Besides, as Greswell well remarks, "one like St. Luke or St. Mark, who, though not an eye-witness of the events recorded by St. Matthew, yet proposed to write an account of them, it might naturally be supposed, even humanly speaking, would take so much the greater pains to remedy this defect, both by acquiring a perfect knowledge of his subject, and by verifying in every instance the order of his facts[h]."

The manner of narration peculiar to the apostle, is such as might be expected from an eye-witness, or from one deriving his information from eye-witnesses. The impressions made upon his mind by scenes and circumstances, are recorded with artlessness—without any apparent aim at effect. His sentences are constructed without the roundness which bespeaks reflection and research. There is a want of picturesqueness and vivid painting. The writer does not go into circumstantial details, except in the discourses and moral instructions of Christ, which are described with great distinctness and particularity. But he narrates with unstudied clearness things which he saw, or of which he had been informed by others, placing them in such order as might best exhibit the

[g] Notes to Michaelis, vol. iii. part 2, p. 9.
[h] Dissertations, etc. vol. i. pp. 236, 237.

greatness of the Redeemer as a teacher and prophet. The higher and more spiritual aspects of the Saviour's person are not presented. Here that distinguished Being is depicted as the great descendant of David, on whom Jewish expectation was centered — as the substance of type and prophecy in the ancient dispensation. We see a marvellous character, whose perfect acquaintance with the Jewish economy, and striking power of attesting his mission, announce *the prophet* greater than Moses. Still however he is invested with the temporal and the Jewish, rather than the divine and the eternal.

(*b*) The diction of Matthew partakes of a strongly Hebraised character. The Hebraisms of it are more marked than those of the other Gospels. It is unnecessary to adduce proofs of this assertion, because they are so abundant. The style bears some similarity to that of Mark, as was long since remarked by Erasmus, so that Greswell ventures to infer, that Mark was the translator of the Hebrew Gospel. But the occurrence of Latin terms in the Gospel of Matthew will be reckoned no presumption that it was translated at Rome when it is remembered, that Matthew, as a tax-gatherer for the Roman government, must have come in contact, by the very nature of his office, with persons using the Latin language. Neither does the coincidence between the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, in the use of such remarkable words as *ἀγγαρεῦσαι* — *φραγελλῶσαι* — *κολοβῶσαι*, afford any argument, by which it is rendered probable that the translator of the one, and the author of the other, were the same person; because this phenomenon may be equally explained by the circumstance, that the Greek translator of Matthew's Gospel made use of Mark's, retaining his very words in some instances.

The following characteristics of language and expression have been deduced by Credner from a careful collation of the first Gospel. Proceeding on the principles of Gersdorf[1], and following out his researches in this department, he arrived at these results:—

1. The usual formula prefixed to passages of the Old Testament quoted to prove the Messiahship of Jesus is, *ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (κυρίου) διὰ τοῦ προφήτου*, i. 22, ii. 15, which

[1] Beiträge zur Sprachcharacteristik der Schriftsteller des N. T.

is generally abbreviated in the chapters subsequent to the second, though even there the abridged form appears as in ii. 5, 17. Thus we find it in iii. 3; iv. 14; viii. 17; xii. 17; xiii. 14, 35; xxi. 4; xxvi. 56; xxvii. 9. The formula *τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν, ἵνα κ. τ. λ.* is particularly deserving of notice, i. 22; xxi. 4; xxvi. 56.

2. The expression *υἱὸς Δαβὶδ* is applied to Jesus, i. 1, 20; ix. 27; xii. 23; xv. 22; xx. 30, 31; xxi. 9, 15; comp. xxii. 42. In Mark and Luke it is of rarer occurrence.

3. *ἡ ἁγία πόλις*, and *ὁ ἅγιος τόπος*, descriptive of Jerusalem, iv. 5; xxiv. 15; xxvii. 53.

4. *ἐθνικός* occurs only in Matt. vi. 7; viii. 17.

5. *συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος*, xiii. 39, 40, 49; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20. The only other place of the New Testament, where the same phrase occurs is Heb. ix. 26.

6. *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, iii. 2; iv. 17; v. 3, 10, 20; vii. 21; viii. 11; x. 7; xi. 11, 12; xiii. 11, 24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 52; xvi. 19; xviii. 1, 3, 4, 23; xix. 12; xx. 1; xxii. 2; xxiii. 13; xxv. 1. The corresponding expression of the other New Testament writers is *βασιλεία θεοῦ*.

7. *ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος*, vi. 14, 26, 32; xv. 32.

ὁ πατὴρ (*ὁ θεὸς*) *ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, v. 16, 45, 48; vi. 1, 9; vii. 11, 21; x. 32, 33; xii. 50; xvi. 17; xviii. 10, 14, 19; xxii. 30; xxiii. 9.

There can be little doubt, that these modes of expression evince the Jewish conceptions of the writer, as well as of the readers to whom they were addressed.

8. *Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός*, i. 16; xxvii. 17, 22.

9. *Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος*, iv. 18; x. 2.

10. In adducing names or surnames, *ὁ λεγόμενος* is the prevailing expression, ii. 23; ix. 9; xxvi. 5, 14, 36; xxvii. 16, 17, 22, 33.

11. *ῥηθείς, ῥηθέν, ἐῤῥέθη* (*διά*), i. 22; ii. 15, 17, 23; iii. 3; iv. 14; v. 21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43; viii. 17; xii. 17; xiii. 35; xxii. 31; xxiv. 15; xxvii. 9, 35. Mark alone, of the other evangelists, has *τὸ ῥηθέν*, xiii. 14.

12. *ἀναχωρέω*, to return, ii. 12, 13, 14, 22; iv. 12; ix. 24; xii. 15; xiv. 13; xv. 21; xxvii. 5.

It is remarkable that Matthew never uses *ἀναστρέφω* in this sense, as Luke does.

13. *κατ' ὄναρ*, i. 20; ii. 12, 13, 19, 22; xxvii. 19.

14. *βρέχειν*, *βροχή*, in the sense of *rain*, *to rain*, v. 45; vii. 25, 27. In Luke, it means to moisten, vii. 38, 44.

15. *προσέρχεσθαι* is employed in a sort of Oriental manner, for the purpose of expanding a discourse, iv. 3; viii. 5, 19, 25; ix. 14, 20; xiii. 10, 27, 36; xiv. 12, 15; xv. 1, 2, 23, etc.

16. In a similar way, the participle *πορευθείς* (*πορευθέντες*) is used, ii. 8; ix. 13; xi. 4; xvii. 27; xxviii. 7, 19; xxi. 6; xxii. 15; xxv. 16; xxvi. 14; xxvii. 66.

17. *σφόδρα* is constantly put after the verb, ii. 10; xvii. 6, 23; xviii. 31; xix. 25; xxvi. 22; xxvii. 54. The word occurs but once in Mark and Luke.

18. *τότε* is the usual particle of transition in noticing time, as in ii. 7, 16, 17; iii. 5, 13, 15; iv. i, 5, 10, 11, 17; v. 24, etc. The adverb occurs ninety times in Matthew, in Mark six, and in Luke fourteen times.

19. *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε*, vii. 28; xi. 1; xiii. 53; xix. 1; xxvi. 1. Luke, on the other hand, has *ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο*, *καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο*.

20. *ἕως οὗ*, applied to time, i. 25; xiii. 33; xiv. 22; xvii. 9; xviii. 30, 34; xxvi. 36. Luke has more frequently *ἕως ὅτου*.

21. *ἐν ἐκεινῷ τῷ καιρῷ*, xi. 25; xii. 1; xiv. 1. On the other hand, Mark and Luke employ *ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ*.

ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, and *ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης*, viii. 13; ix. 22; x. 19; xv. 28; xvii. 18; xviii. 1; xxvi. 55. Mark has but once *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ*, xiii. 11. Luke uses *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ*.

22. *πᾶς ὅστις*, vii. 24; x. 32; xix. 29. Luke uses only *πᾶς ὅς*.

23. *ποιεῖν ὡς*, *ὥσπερ*, *ὡσαύτως*, *καθώς*, i. 24; vi. 2; xx. 5; xxi. 6; xxvi. 19; xxviii. 15. Luke employs *ποιεῖν ὁμοίως*, and other expressions.

24. *ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς*, xi. 1.; xiii. 53; xix. 1; xxvi. 1.

25. *εἷς τούτων* or *αὐτῶν* or *ἐξ αὐτῶν*, vi. 29; x. 29, 42; xviii. 6, 10, 12; xx. 13; xxii. 35; xxv. 40, 45; xxvii. 48.

26. Matthew employs *τάφος* in addition to *μνημεῖον*, both being used accurately, xxiii. 27, 29; xxvii. 61, 64, 66; xxviii. 1. On the other hand, Mark, Luke, and John use *μνημεῖον* alone, and sometimes *μνῆμα*.

27. *συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν*, xii. 14; xxii. 15; xxvii. 1, 7; xxviii. 12.

28. *μαλακία, μαλακός*, iv. 23; ix. 35; x. 1; xi. 8. Luke is the only other evangelist who has the adjective, and that only once, vii. 25.

29. *μαθητεύειν*, xiii. 52; xxvii. 57; xxviii. 19.

30. *σεληνιάζεσθαι*, iv. 24; xvii. 15.

31. Matthew frequently uses *ἰδοὺ* after the genitive absolute, i. 20; ii. 1, 13, 19; ix. 18, 32; xii. 46; xvii. 5; xxvi. 47. In introducing something new, *καὶ ἰδού* is often employed as ii. 9; iii. 16, 17; iv. 11; vii. 4; viii. 32, 34; ix. 2, 20; xii. 9, 41, 42; xv. 22; xvii. 3; xix. 16; xx. 30; xxvi. 51; xxvii. 50; xxviii. 2, 9, 20.

32. The sacred writer very often begins a sentence with a participle, continuing it for the most part in a definite tense, without the interposition of a secondary clause, i. 24; ii. 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 22, 23; iii. 7, 16; iv. 2, 12, 14, 18, 20, 21, 22; v. 1, 2; viii. 1, 5, 10, 14, 16, 18, 25, 28, 32, 33, 34; ix. 1, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, etc. Constructions in which participles stand in close connexion with verbs are frequent ex. gr. with *ἐγερθείς*, ii. 13, 14, 20, 21; viii. 26; ix. 6, 19; with *πεσών*, ii. 11; iv. 9; xviii. 26, 29; xxi. 44; with *ἀποκριθείς*, iii. 15; iv. 4; viii. 8; xi. 4, 25; xii. 39, 48; xiii. 11, 37; xiv. 28; xv. 3, 13, 15, 24, 26, etc. So also with *προσελθὼν* and *πορευθείς*.

33. There is a predilection for a peculiar construction, in which premise and conclusion appear, where the passage presents no reason for it. Thus *εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς*, — viii. 31; *εἰ θέλεις ποιήσωμεν*, xvii. 4; *εἰ θέλεις... εἰσελθεῖν*, etc., xix. 17; *εἰ οὖν Δαυὶδ καλεῖ*, etc., xxii. 45; *εἰ βασιλεὺς... ἐστι*, xxvii. 42; *ὅτε δὲ ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος*, ix. 25; *ὅτε οὖν ἤγγισεν ὁ καιρός*, xxi. 34; *ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος*, xxi. 40; *ὃν ἐὰν εἴπητέ μοι*, xxi. 24. In the parallel passages to these examples, in Mark and Luke, the construction is different.

34. Matthew usually places adverbs after the imperative, ii. 8, 13; iii. 15; iv. 6; v. 24, 25; vi. 11, 33; vii. 5; viii. 21; x. 6, 28; xiii. 30; xiv. 8, 18; xvii. 17, 20; xviii. 16; xxiii. 26; xxiv. 18; xxv. 9; xxvi. 45; xxvii. 42, 43. The only exception is *οὕτως*.

35. *οὕτω, οὕτως*, are constantly put before the verb, i. 18; ii. 5; iii. 15; v. 12, 16, 47; vi. 9, 30; vii. 12, 17; xi. 26; xii. 40, 45; xiii. 40, 49, etc.

36. The numeral *δύο* is prefixed to its substantive, and put in the same case, rather than followed by the genitive, iv. 21; vi. 24; viii. 28; ix. 27; x. 10, 29; xiv. 17; xviii. 8; xix. 16; xx. 30; xxiv. 41; xxv. 22; xxvi. 2, 60; xxvii. 38.

37. *προσκυνεῖν τινι*, ii. 2, 8, 11; iv. 9; viii. 2, 9, 18; xiv. 33; xv. 25; xviii. 26; xx. 20; xxviii. 9, 17. Mark has also the dative, but Luke and John have more frequently the accusative.

38. *ἐγείρεσθαι* and *διεγείρεσθαι ἀπὸ*, i. 24; xiv. 2; xxvi. 19; xxvii. 64; xxviii. 7, 15. The other New Testament writers use *ἐκ* instead of *ἀπό*.

39. Matthew constantly employs the participle *λέγων*, without the dative of the person addressed, i. 20; ii. 2, 13, 20; iii. 2, 14, 17; v. 2; vi. 31; viii. 2, 3, 6, 25, 27, 29, 31; ix. 14, 18, 29, 30, 33; x. 5., etc.

40. *ὀμνύω* with *εἰς* or *ἐν* following, applied to the person or thing by which one swears, which is a Hebraism, v. 34, 35, 36; xxiii. 16, 18, 21, 22.

41. *ἀκούσω* instead of *ἀκούσομαι*, xii. 19; xiii. 14, 15.

42. The usual word in Matthew's Gospel is *Ἱεροσόλυμα*, ii. 1, 3; iii. 5; iv. 25; v. 35; xv. 1; xvi. 21; xx. 17, 18; xxi. 1, 10.

43. The following expressions should also be noticed, which are either peculiar to Matthew, or used by him far more frequently than by the other New Testament writers:—*φρόνιμος, οἰκιακός, ὕστερον, ἐκεῖθεν, διστάζειν, καταποντίζεσθαι, μεταίρειν, ῥαπίζειν, φράζειν, συναίρειν λόγον*, etc.

V. Apostolic Origin or Authenticity.

The present Greek work has been uniformly ascribed to Matthew the apostle as its author, at least from the middle of the second century. At the same time, the voice of antiquity is agreed in affirming that the apostle wrote in Hebrew, not in Greek; nor is any intimation given that he made *editions* of the same work, or that *he himself* translated it into Greek. Our present Gospel cannot therefore be *immediately* and *directly* authentic. Yet it may be properly styled *authentic*, because it is the free translation of

Matthew's Hebrew document. The words are not the apostle's, but those of the translator. But the matter of it belongs to Matthew. The substance of it is his, even though the translator did probably depart in several instances from the letter of the Aramaean Gospel. It cannot be called an entirely independent work, composed in Greek and exhibiting various disfigurements of the original in the shape of later traditions, but a document bearing so close an affinity to that from which it was taken, that it was universally cited as the Gospel *of Matthew*, and believed to possess canonical authority. Those fathers who assert that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, also assert that his work was translated into Greek, and unhesitatingly employ the present Greek Gospel as a faithful representative of the apostolic production. Hence, though all the testimonies of antiquity refer to *the Hebrew* Gospel as proceeding directly from the hand of Matthew, the Greek document is not thereby divested of its apostolical character and authority. The earliest writers do not so treat it. On the contrary, having the Greek in their hands, they were not solicitous about the Hebrew, but allowed it to remain almost exclusively in the possession of a class of Christians who became more and more separate from the great body of believers. Thus they attributed the Greek as well as the Hebrew work to Matthew. They used the former as a credible sacred book. They proceeded on the assumption of its *substantial* authenticity and unquestionable genuineness. We shall now look at their writings as far as they bear on the present question.

In the so-called apostolic fathers there are various allusions, more or less definite, to the facts and doctrines of the evangelical history. And yet they contain no quotation professedly taken from a written Gospel; nor do they bear the name of an evangelist attached to his work. Hence a difficulty arises in dealing with them. All must allow that traditional accounts of Christ were early current among his followers; and that certain parts of his life may have been committed to writing before the appearance of the canonical Gospels. Were these passages therefore in the apostolical fathers derived from oral tradition, or from written documents? Do the references they contain suppose the existence of the sacred books, or may they be explained equally well on

another hypothesis? The answer to these questions must be founded on a candid examination of all the circumstances surrounding a particular case, for no *a priori* principle can furnish a secure explanation suitable alike to all passages. It has been thought indeed that acquaintance with a particular Gospel may be inferred when passages from it alone are exhibited, and that too, nearly in the same words; but even this fact is not demonstrative. Other particulars may counterbalance it.

Assuming it then as highly probable, that many sayings of our Lord were traditionally current in the first and second centuries, let us look at the writings of the apostolic fathers. The first epistle of Clement, and that of Polycarp, are the only works that can be fairly used in the argument. The Pastor of Hermas, and the production attributed to Barnabas, must be brought down to a later period than the first century. The epistles of Ignatius, even in the shorter recension, are suspicious in respect of their genuineness, and hence no reliance can be placed on them. Clement and Polycarp alone remain.

In the forty-sixth chapter of Clement's first epistle to the Corinthians is the following passage, whose original is sought by many in Matthew and Luke; *the first part* in the former alone:— *Μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. εἶπε γάρ· οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη, ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι· κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτῷ, περιτεθῆναι μύλον, καὶ καταποντισθῆναι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι.* "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus. For he said, Woe to that man. It were better for him that he had not been born, than that he should offend one of my elect. It were better for him that a millstone should be tied about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the sea, than that he should offend one of my little ones." It is possible that Clement may have cited these passages out of the Gospels from memory, bringing them together, as was not unusual, from different places. But it is also possible that they may not have been taken from the canonical Gospels, because the writer does not allude to *written* documents. He may have been indebted for them to oral tradition, or even to some unauthorised productions bearing the name of Gospel. Hence nothing can be built on the entire

passage in proof of the position that Clement had the Greek Gospel of Matthew in his hands.

Another passage in Clement's epistle, which has been considered a citation from Matthew, occurs in the thirteenth chapter:— *Μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, οὓς ἐλάλησεν διδάσκων ἐπιείκειαν καὶ μακροθυμίαν. οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν· ἐλεεῖτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε· ἀφίετε, ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν· ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτω ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς δίδοτε, οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς κρίνετε, οὕτως κριθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν· ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.* "Especially remembering the words of the Lord Jesus which he spake, teaching gentleness and long-suffering. For thus he said: Be ye merciful, that ye may obtain mercy: forgive, that it may be forgiven unto you. As ye do, so shall it be done unto you: as ye give, so shall it be given unto you: as ye judge, so shall ye be judged: as ye shew kindness, so shall kindness be shewn unto you: with what measure ye mete, with the same shall it be measured to you." These words do not strictly agree with one, or with several, passages in any or all of the four Gospels; nor can it be affirmed that they were uttered by Christ in this form and mode. There is nothing in the connexion which points to a written source from which they were derived: on the contrary, the introductory phrase is more favourable to the supposition of their being taken by Clement from tradition, than from Matthew or Luke.

In the epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, are a number of passages corresponding to texts in Matthew. Most of them, however, have no claim to be considered loose quotations from the apostle. The inquiry must be narrowed down to one passage, which is supposed to be cited from the first Gospel, even by such as lay no stress on the other apostolic fathers in support of the authenticity of the sacred book. The place to which we refer is the following:— *Μνημονεύοντες δὲ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ κύριος διδάσκων· μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε· ἀφίετε, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν· ἐλεεῖτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε· ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν· καὶ ὅτι μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ καὶ οἱ διωκόμενοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.* "But remembering what the Lord said teaching; Judge not, that ye be not judged: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven: be ye merciful, that ye may obtain mercy:

with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. And, blessed are the poor, and they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of God."

In regard to this passage, three hypotheses are probable.

(*a*) It may be a memoriter citation from the Greek Gospel of Matthew.

(*b*) It may be taken from some other Gospel then in use.

(*c*) It may have been received by oral communication from apostles or immediate disciples of Jesus. In favour of the last is Irenaeus's statement, to the effect that he had heard Polycarp "repeating the oral relations of John, and of other hearers of the Lord, concerning the doctrine and miracles of Jesus, all conformably to the Scriptures, that is to the Gospels." Besides, Polycarp nowhere alludes to a *written* Gospel, so that the place is not sufficient or satisfactory evidence of the existence of our present first Gospel in his time. Olshausen, however, affirms that it is made up of two quotations, the words *καὶ ὅτι* forming the transition between them. The former is said to be taken from Matth. vii. 1; but the words *ἀφίετε καὶ· ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν· ἐλεεῖτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε* are not there. They are referred to vi. 14, and v. 7, and yet even there they do not occur. There is only a general similarity in sentiment. The second citation is said to be compounded of Matth. v. 1, 10, but yet the words are not exactly the same. The difference between the passage of Clement, already given, and that of Polycarp, renders it probable that both were taken from a traditional source. That the Greek Gospel had appeared before the time of Polycarp we fully believe; but his epistle scarcely demonstrates the fact. It *may be* affirmed, as it has been by many, that he has truly cited the Gospel; but yet others may aver, with a degree of probability scarcely inferior, that he was indebted to traditional accounts for the passage in question. On the whole, little stress can be laid on the writings of the apostolic fathers, in proof of the position that the Greek Gospel of Matthew was used in them. We believe, indeed, that those fathers were by no means ignorant of its existence; but that belief can only be communicated to our opponents by reasoning independent of the works in question. Strong considerations exist in favour of the authenticity of Matthew's Gospel; let us

not weaken or endanger it, by calling in the feeble aid to which we have been adverting.

We now come to the testimony of Papias, in which Matthew is first named as the writer of a Gospel:—*Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο· ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.*

Here it will be observed, that the bishop speaks of a time when the Aramaean original alone existed. And his language presupposes a Greek version at the time he was writing, for the aorist *ἡρμήνευσε* refers to a thing that was, but is so no longer. "Matthew *wrote* the oracles in Hebrew, and every one *translated* them as well as he could." The existence of a Greek Gospel is here implied. There is no evidence to prove that he had seen or was acquainted with the Hebrew original of which he speaks. The document, which every one translated as he was able, was not in common use. It had been superseded to a great extent by another which was generally acknowledged.

Thus much may be deduced from the words regarded as the statement of Papias himself. Yet we believe, with Sieffert, that the statement rather belongs to the presbyter John, which Papias gives as he received it from him. He derived it from John. He has not, however, quoted *the written* words of the presbyter; nor is he to be regarded as giving his precise language. If this were so, it would indicate the existence of an ecclesiastically received Greek Gospel in the time of the presbyter; or at least, that the presbyter spoke of a practice which was then no longer in existence. *The aorist* *ἡρμήνευσε* belongs rather to Papias than John the presbyter, as far as the continuance of the action denoted by the verb is involved in it. By means of it, the existence of *a Greek Gospel* is brought into the beginning of the second century; and since no subsequent time can be pointed out in which THE PRESENT Greek Gospel probably appeared, we infer the identity of the Gospel recognised in the beginning of the second century with that which we now possess.

But the words of Papias containing John's statement have been employed *against* the authenticity of the first Gospel. According to Schleiermacher[k], followed by Credner, Weisse,

[k] In the Studien und Kritiken by Ullmann and Umbreit, 1832, Heft 4.

Lachmann[l], Reuss[m], Baumgarten-Crusius[n], Wieseler[o], and others, the term λόγια denotes a collection of our Lord's remarkable sayings written by Matthew in Hebrew, which one person, or several, extended and explained by the addition of facts and circumstances relating to time and place. The Aramaean document containing the λόγια, formed *the basis* of the present Greek Gospel. But that this meaning of λόγια, by which the word is restricted to *the discourses* of Christ, is inadmissible, may be shewn by the context of the passage in Eusebius, where Papias's testimony is cited. In speaking of Mark's Gospel, it is related, that the evangelist did not write in regular order (τάξει) the things either spoken or done by Christ (τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα); to which it is immediately subjoined, that Peter gave Mark such instruction as was necessary, but not as a connected history of our Lord's discourses (ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων). Here τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια is explained by τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ πραχθέντα ἢ λεχθέντα, both being used synonymously in relation to the contents of Mark's Gospel. And yet the greater part of the sacred production is occupied with a narration of facts in the life of the Saviour. On the other hand, in speaking of Matthew the writer says, τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο. Thus the συνετάξατο, which is applied to Matthew, refers to the σύνταξις preceding; while τὰ λόγια also refers to λόγια κυριακά. Of Mark, it is stated, that he did not arrange the contents of his Gospel (τάξει) in order, but in such a way as they were related to him by Peter, who, in like manner, did not recite them, ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων; but, on the contrary, Matthew ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο.

In the New Testament, λόγια also appears in a wider sense than that claimed for it by Schleiermacher, as in the epistles to the Romans and Hebrews (Rom. iii. 1, 2: Heb. v. 12), where it denotes *divine revelations;* not simply *the utterances* of Deity, but also *the divine acts and conduct* inseparably connected with them.

The patristic use of λόγιον coincides with the more general

[l] Stud. und Kritik, 1835. p 577, et seqq.
[m] Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften, N. T. § 93, 96. [n] Kommentar, p. 26.
[o] Chronologische Synopse der vier Evangelien, p. 304, et seqq.

sense, as the examples given by Suicer[p] under the word, will shew. Thus, Ignatius, in the larger recension of his epistle to the Christians of Smyrna, quotes a passage from the Acts of the Apostles, with the prefatory formula, *φασὶ γὰρ τὰ λόγια;* and in Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians, it is written:—"For whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, he is antichrist; and whosoever does not confess the testimony of the cross, is of the devil; and whoever perverts the oracles of the Lord (*τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου*) to his own lusts, and says that there shall neither be any resurrection nor judgment, he is the first-born of Satan. Wherefore, leaving the vanity of many, and their false doctrines, let us return to the word that was delivered to us from the beginning (*τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡμῖν παραδοθέντα λόγον*)." Here it is apparent that *τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου* is equivalent to *τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡμῖν παραδοθέντα λόγον, τὰ εὐαγγελισθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν Προφητῶν.* These observations prove the baselessness of Grimm's[q] assertion, that *λόγια* uniformly denotes *discourses* or *utterances*, not *narratives*. The usage of the word differs little from that of *λόγοι;* in the present instance, at least, there seems no perceptible difference. Besides, the title of the work composed by Papias is *κυριακῶν λογίων ἐξήγησις*, which, even judging from the fragments still preserved, must have been occupied not merely with *sayings*, but with *events and facts*.

It is also difficult to conceive, how a document containing a collection of *the mere discourses* of Christ could have been very clear or intelligible. The facts of the evangelical history are so much interwoven with the discourses, as to be necessary for the right understanding of the latter. This is virtually acknowledged by Grimm, in his endeavour to defend the view of Schleiermacher; for in answering the argument that Papias's work, judging from the few remaining fragments, contained *facts* as well as *discourses*, he lays great stress on *the title* *ἐξηγήσεις*, maintaining that the facts of the evangelical history related by Papias served to set the discourses of Jesus in their proper light, and were therefore adduced by Papias to explain the document supposed to consist

[p] Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, s. v.
[q] Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte, p. 22, note.

of the mere discourses or λόγια. But who does not perceive the improbability of an apostle writing λόγια, as explained by Schleiermacher? Grimm's defence of what must be termed an untenable explanation, tends to impugn the common sense of an apostle. On his own shewing, the λόγια would have been unworthy of Matthew, serving no good purpose or fitting object in their bare individuality, since they needed an account of the circumstances and relations in which they were spoken, to make them rightly apprehended and truly profitable. The facts, doctrines, and discourses are so interwoven that they make a consistent whole; and therefore the supposition of the mere discourses being written by Matthew is highly improbable. This view is confirmed by the arrangement of the facts in our Gospel. Similar ones are grouped together, just as similar discourses are grouped; and that too, in cases where there is a deviation from Mark and Luke. The one principle of combination pervades discourses and facts, both together making up a Gospel characterised by unity and compactness.

We cannot understand the assertion of Grimm, that the state of the present Gospel supports the view taken by Schleiermacher. Discourses of a similar character are indeed put together; but that the original document of Matthew may be still recognised in these groupings is very questionable. Who shall undertake to separate the mere λόγια from the facts and circumstances with which they are surrounded? The attempt has never been seriously made, and we venture to affirm that it is practically impossible. Theorists may pronounce it an easy thing; but the different materials of the Gospel are so interlaced, that they will find it very difficult, if not impossible, to demonstrate the truth of their opinion, by fairly dividing what they declare to be practicable. It is strange too that the early church knew nothing of this apostolic document, so different from the Greek canonical Gospel; or that none of the early fathers, such as Irenaeus and Eusebius, discovered its existence.

Thus λόγια can mean nothing else, in the passage of Papias preserved by Eusebius, than a Gospel containing a record both of the sayings and doings of our Lord. The Phrygian father alludes to nothing else than the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, designating

it *a potiori*, a *σύνταγμα τῶν λογίων*, as is fully conceded by Baur[1].

There has also been considerable discussion as to the true sense of *ἡρμήνευσε*, some assigning to it that of *translate*, others *interpret*. Lücke, who adopts the former, supposes in consequence that there were several written translations made by unknown authors; but this is improbable. Thiersch explains it of *oral paraphrase*, when the Hebrew Matthew was publicly read in churches where all the members did not understand Hebrew. In that case the reader, or rather the president, after reading the text in Aramaean, gave a Greek paraphrase, as was done when the Old Testament was read in the synagogue, after Hebrew ceased to be a spoken language. This view appears to us an unnecessary restriction of the term *ἕκαστος*. Why should the word be confined to the presidents of churches? The best explanation appears to be, *translated to himself*, which is equivalent to that of *explaining* or *interpreting* advocated by Sieffert. Those who had the Aramaean document in their hands, endeavoured, as well as they could, to ascertain its meaning; which they, being Greeks (for *ἕκαστος* must be restricted to persons to whom, like Papias himself, the Hebrew was not vernacular), best did by translating it to themselves.

Much has been written for the purpose of shewing that Papias's testimony, or rather that of John the presbyter, has *a distant* relation to the present Greek Gospel. Sieffert even ventures to affirm, that the canonical Greek book may not have been known in Phrygia when Papias lived. But the man whom Eusebius styles *τῆς γραφῆς εἰδήμων*, a hearer of John the presbyter, a companion of Polycarp, who made use of testimonies (*κέχρηται μαρτυρίαις*) from the first epistle of John, and from that of Peter, and who was acquainted with Mark's Gospel, cannot reasonably be deemed ignorant of the first Gospel. Nor can it be questioned that the Greek, rather than the Aramaean book, was current in Phrygia, or known at least to the bishop of Hierapolis.

On the whole, we cannot doubt that *λόγια* referred to the Aramaean Gospel of Matthew, and that the present Greek one stood in a close relation to it. It is certainly a free translation, so much so as to have the character and appearance of an original; but that

[1] Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, pp. 580, 1.

the translator inserted various traditions in it, has not been proved.

It is quite probable that Basilides (A.D. 125) was acquainted with the Gospel of Matthew, since various references to it are given by Clement of Alexandria; and if Epiphanius[s] is to be credited, he even misapplied the passage in vii. 6. The probability of his possessing the Gospel in question is increased to certainty, when we find his son Isidore giving a remarkable explanation of Jesus's answer to the apostles, when they inquired whether it was better to marry or not. The reply of Christ to the question occurs in Matthew alone.

The Prodicians or followers of Prodicus, had the same Gospel; for in the assertion that they were bound by no law, *ὡς ἂν κύριοι τοῦ σαββάτου, καὶ ὑπεράνω παντὸς γένους πεφυκότες, βασίλειοι παῖδες*, there is a manifest allusion to the words of Jesus found in the first Gospel alone (xvii. 25, etc).

Valentinus and his followers used the same Gospel, if a work of the former, entitled *πιστὴ σοφία*, preserved in a Coptic translation, be authentic; for in it are citations of various passages, such as vii. 7, 8; x. 36, 41; xi. 14, 28; xiii. 9; xxiv. 4, 22, 43; xxviii. 18; and in one of his letters occur the words, evidently taken from Matth. v. 8:—*ἡ καρδία . . . . . ἐπειδὰν ἐπισκέψηται αὐτὴν ὁ μόνος ἀγαθὸς Πατὴρ, ἡγιάσται, καὶ φῶτι διαλάμπει· καὶ οὕτω μακαρίζεται ὁ ἔχων τὴν τοιάυτην (καθαρὰν) καρδίαν, ὅτι ὄψεται τὸν θεόν*. It should be mentioned, however, that though the authenticity of this work be assumed by Hug, it is questioned by Matter[t] and others, with some reason. According to Irenaeus, the Valentinians appealed to the Gospel of Matthew in favour of some of their mystical numbers, to *ἰῶτα*, which stands for *ten*, in Matth. v. 18. They also referred to Matth. v. 13, and x. 34[u].

Marc, from whom the Marcosians derived their name, argues from Matth. xviii. 10, and xi. 28[x].

Ptolemy, in his epistle to Flora, frequently appeals to passages of the first Gospel in proof of his statements, such as Matth. xix. 8, 6; xv. 4-6; v. 17, 39[y].

[s] Haer. xxiv. c. 5.
[t] Histoire crit. du Gnosticisme, vol. ii. p. 103, et seqq.
[u] Lib. i. advers. haeres.
[x] Lib. i. c. 14, 20.
[y] Epiphan. haeres. xxxiii. c. 3, et seqq.

Heraclcon refers to the passage, Matth. viii. 12[z].

Celsus the heathen was acquainted with Matthew, as well as the other Gospels; a fact apparent from Origen's reply which represents him as saying, "that the composers of the genealogies were extravagant in making Jesus descend from the first man, and the Jewish kings." In another place we are informed, that he stated, "To the sepulchre of Jesus there came two angels, as is said by *some*, or as by others, *one only*." This is a proof that he knew four Gospels only.

In relation to the *ἀπομνημονεύματα* of Justin Martyr, which he states to have been written by apostles, or their companions, and to which he even applies the title, *εὐαγγέλια* and *εὐαγγέλιον*, it is now generally admitted, after the researches of Winer[a], Olshausen[b], Mynster[c], Norton[d], and Bindemann[e], that they are none other than the four canonical Gospels. This is allowed even by De Wette. Regarding it therefore as *proved*, that these *memoirs* are the canonical Gospels, it is undeniable that Justin quotes the first very frequently; sometimes literally, sometimes freely. The following passages peculiar to Matthew are cited by him. Matth. v. 16, 20, 22, 28, 34, 37, 41, 45; vi. 1; vii. 15, 19; xix. 11; xvi. 17, 18; xvii. 11-13; xxiii. 27. They may be found in Credner's Beiträge, i. p. 151, etc., and in De Wette's Einleitung.

The Harmony (*τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων*) of his disciple Tatian, based on the Four Gospels, is an evidence of the same fact.

In Athenagoras's Apology for the Christians, addressed to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, he tells them the maxims of the Christians:—*Λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους, προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς, ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὃς τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους.* This language is manifestly taken from Matth. v. 44, 45.

Theophilus of Antioch has the citations:—*Ἡ δὲ εὐαγγέλιος φωνὴ ἐπιτατικώτερον διδάσκει περὶ ἁγνείας λέγουσα· πᾶς ὁ ἰδὼν γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρίαν πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν, ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν*

[z] Origen, Commentar. in Joann. tom. xiii. c. 59.
[a] Justin Martyr. evangg. can. usum fuisse ostenditur. 1819, 4to.
[b] Die Echtheit, etc. p. 289, et seqq. [c] Kleine Theolog. Schriften, No. 1.
[d] The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels, vol. i. note E.
[e] Studien und Kritiken, 1842, p. 415, et seqq.

αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ γαμῶν, φησὶν, ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς, μοιχεύει· καὶ ὃς ἀπολύει γυναῖκα παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας, ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι.—Τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον, ἀγαπᾶτε, φησὶ, τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς. Ἐὰν γάρ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποῖον μισθὸν ἔχετε; τοῦτο καὶ οἱ λῃσταὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιοῦσι.—Μὴ γνώτω γὰρ, φησὶν, ἡ χείρ σου ἡ ἀριστερὰ, τί ποιεῖ ἡ χείρ σου ἡ δεξιά; from Matth. v. 28, 32, 44, 46; vi. 3.

From the fragments of Hegesippus which have been preserved, it is obvious that he refers to the history of Christ in the second chapter of Matthew, and quotes chap. xiii. 16.

It is unnecessary to allude, on the present occasion, to the extracts of a Gnostic writer named Theodotus, which have been preserved among the writings of Clement of Alexandria.

It is also universally admitted, that Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Jerome, and succeeding fathers, cited the present Greek Gospel as sacred and authoritative. Thus it is certain, that the Greek Gospel was universally circulated about the middle of the second century, not only among the catholic Christians, but also among the different sects of heretics. But we are even brought to the beginning of the second century by the fact, that Papias speaks of the act implied in *ἡρμήνευσε*, as a thing immediately consequent on the composition of the Aramaean Gospel, *but no longer existing*. And why did not every one continue to translate it to himself as well as he could? The only reasonable assumption is, that a version possessing ecclesiastical authority had got into circulation. Now Papias was a hearer of John the presbyter, who was *a disciple of the Lord*, and thus we are virtually brought to the time of John the apostle, in which the Greek Gospel originated. Our conclusion therefore is, that, as far as historical testimony and all the probabilities of the case point the inquirer, a Greek Gospel, the faithful representative or substitute of an Aramaean original, appeared during the life of John the apostle, which Christians universally received as sacred and authoritative. The author indeed must ever remain unknown; but whether he were an apostle or not, he must have had the highest sanction in his proceeding. His work was performed with the cognisance and under the eye of apostolic

men. The reception it met with proved the general belief of his calling and competency to the task. Divine superintendence was exercised over him.

This date of the Greek Gospel is in accordance with the fact that the Greek language, even during the life of Christ, was daily spreading in Palestine; and that many of the Jewish Christians, especially the more enlightened, learned it from intercourse with the Greek-speaking population. The necessity for a Gospel in that language must have been felt not long after the appearance of the Hebrew copy. The number of Christians who understood the former rapidly increased, in comparison with those to whom the latter was vernacular.

Those who assign the origin of the Greek Gospel to any part of the second century, whether its commencement, middle, or close, must find *a fitting time* for its appearance, when the early Christians had no reverence for their sacred books, and would therefore have received the production of an unauthorised man without hesitation, as a book of ecclesiastical authority; or when the fathers expressed their *individual* views simply in relation to the Gospels, without embodying the sentiments of the Christians of their age generally. But it is impossible to do so. Apocryphal Gospels and spurious books appeared in abundance; yet they were rejected. Heretics were charged by the catholic Christians with corruptions; but none ever advanced a charge against the author of the Greek Gospel. On the contrary, it bore the title *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον* from an early period, at least in the first half of the second century, for both Irenaeus, and Clement of Alexandria, employ the superscription, and in cod. B. we find simply *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*. That the appellation *κατὰ Ματθαῖον* is indicative of authorship there cannot be much doubt, although the title did not proceed from the writer himself; for it corresponds to the Hebrew לְ *auctoris*, and is so employed in 2 Maccab. ii. 13, and Epiphan. Haer. viii. 4. The expression *κατὰ Ματθαῖον* is *virtually* equivalent to *Ματθαίου*, else *κατὰ Μάρκον* and *κατὰ Λουκᾶν* should rather have been *κατὰ Πέτρον* and *κατὰ Παῦλον*, conformably to the voice of tradition, which asserts that these two Gospels were composed under the influence and authority of Peter and Paul respectively. We are quite aware of the force of

Meyer's remarks directed against those who say that the accusative, with the preposition, is here a *precise* equivalent to the genitive case; but although it is not strictly speaking synonymous with the genitive, it is most probable that the person who originally applied it, *meant* that Matthew was the writer.

From the earliest period to which the historical evidence affecting the question extends, the first Gospel was employed as the production of Matthew the apostle, and was consequently regarded as equally authoritative with any other Gospel or portion of the New Testament. When the fathers speak of the four canonical Gospels, they uniformly assign the first to Matthew. Though it was the universal belief that the apostle wrote in Hebrew, the opinion prevailed from the beginning that the Greek Gospel also belonged to him. The fathers held, that the latter proceeded indirectly from him—that it was a version of the Aramaean original. This is apparent from the words of Jerome:—"Quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est." Hence we infer *the essential* identity of the Greek Gospel with the Aramaean original. Even Sieffert admits that the fathers believed the Greek to be of equal authority with the Hebrew. Exception, however, is taken to the substantial identity of the documents, notwithstanding all the probabilities in its favour, from the uncritical character of the early fathers generally, their unacquaintedness with the primitive Aramaean Gospel, and the mode in which they speak of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. And yet such men as Origen and Jerome both saw and employed the Hebrew original. They were versed in sacred criticism. The former, especially, was not disposed in scriptural matters to rely on current report, but to inquire for himself. The manner in which the two speak of the Gospel according to the Hebrews evinces their caution, since they strongly suspected it to have been corrupted by the heretical Jewish Christians. Sieffert, indeed, directs attention to the want of precision in the expressions employed by the early writers on this point; but that very circumstance is a presumption in favour of the correctness and currency of their sentiments. They gave expression to the general belief of the period to which they belonged, without betraying anxiety about the definiteness of their language, because

they knew of none who entertained an opposite opinion, and did not write with gainsayers in their view.

Those who impugn the authenticity of the Greek Gospel, desert antiquity in denying its identity with the Aramaean written by Matthew, while they maintain the opinion of that same antiquity concerning the fact of Matthew writing in Hebrew. They must therefore admit, that historical testimony is partly opposed to them, inasmuch as they follow it to a certain extent, and then abandon its guidance. Now there must be strong reasons for doing so. Such reasons, they imagine, lie in *the internal character* of the Gospel itself. *There* they discover spurious additions incongruous with the mind and age of an apostle. Hence they reject the idea of the Greek being a faithful transcript of the Hebrew. The fathers, as far as we can judge, believed that it was essentially the same; but the critics of modern times regard the additions and interpolations they have discovered, as militating against the apostolic origin of the Greek. It cannot safely be alleged, that during the interval between the composition and translation of the Gospel, it suffered any material corruption. For this there is no evidence, neither is there any thing to prove that the translator did not faithfully follow the copy before him. But there are phenomena in the Gospel itself, which have led to the inference that it is not properly a version, but the independent work of some unknown author, who incorporated with the substance of the Aramaean original traditionary stories and myths unworthy of an apostle, or accounts contradictory to those of John. These passages we shall now examine, hoping to shew that they do not form a sufficient ground for denying the apostolicity of the Greek Gospel.

The topic has been abundantly canvassed, on internal grounds, especially in Germany, within the last twenty years. There, able and learned theologians have impugned the apostolic authenticity of Matthew's Gospel, with weapons drawn from the document itself. It will therefore be necessary to enter at some length on the discussion,—so far at least as not to omit any argument deemed to be of importance at the present time. We shall have respect to the objections adduced against the apostolic authority by De Wette, in the latest editions of his

Introduction and Commentary on the Gospel, as they appear to have been carefully weighed and separated by that writer.

1. An eye-witness and apostle would not have passed over in silence the ministry of Jesus in Judea, especially as it is probable in itself, and pre-supposed even by Matthew (xxiii. 37; xxvii. 57).

This argument is largely insisted on by Scheckenburger[f] who affirms, that the unknown author of the first Gospel was ignorant of the fact that the Saviour taught in Judea and Jerusalem as well as in Galilee. In his view, the Jew who drew up the work has omitted all mention of Christ's doings in Judea, because he was unacquainted with them. The position taken is, that the omission arose from ignorance. In examining the question it will be seen, that our inquiries must be confined to that portion of the Gospel contained in chapters iv.—xix., because the circumstances connected with Christ's death subsequently narrated, required to be told in a manner conformable to the facts of his nativity. From the time he entered on his public ministry till he undertook his last journey to Jerusalem, there is said to be no indication of acquaintance on the part of the unknown writer with Jesus' proceedings out of Galilee. And yet the other Gospels prove, that he was also engaged in his works of mercy and love in Judea.

It cannot be denied, that the author of the Gospel has omitted all mention of Christ's proceedings out of Galilee. He has not noticed his public ministry in Judea in express terms. But there are traces of the writer's acquaintance with the fact of Christ's presence in Perea in viii. 18, 23, 28; ix. 1. Here the Saviour is represented as going out of Galilee into that region beyond the sea of Tiberias and Jordan called Perea. It is also implied in Matt. iv. 12, that Jesus had been in Judea. We cannot appeal with Olshausen[g] to ix. 35, where we read, *περιῆγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας κ. τ. λ.*, and argue that the epithet *πάσας* cannot be restricted to Galilee, because there is no mention of that region in the context. In this way *all* the cities and villages of *Palestine* would be meant—the connection not limiting the Saviour's doings to one province. The description

[f] Ueber den Ursprung des ersten kanonischen Evangeliums, p. 8.
[g] His second Erlangen Programm, p. 6.

is said to be general, constituting a brief summary of his ministry. But the commencement of the ninth chapter appears to point out *Galilee* as the sphere of the general circuit described in the verse.

It has been already stated, that neither time nor place is ordinarily regarded in the first Gospel. The writer seldom specifies localities in which transactions took place, or marks the time when they occurred. The discourses of the Saviour, as well as his doings, are treated *summarily*. Chronology was an inferior consideration with the author. In accordance with this design it will not seem surprising, that Judea is not pointed out as the scene, in part, of Jesus' ministry. It cannot be thought strange, that the fact of His going up to observe the stated feasts at Jerusalem is not distinctly recorded in the first Gospel, because the writer's purpose did not lead him to do so. Absolute ignorance cannot be pleaded when we look at chap. xix. 1, and intimations of Jesus' presence in the same regions already noticed, where it is obviously supposed that He passed through Perea. To affirm that an eye-witness and apostle would not have omitted all mention of his Master's ministry out of Galilee, is to judge the case *a priori*. Is it not possible for an eye-witness and an apostle to have been silent in such a matter? Or, if it be not, what gives rise to the impossibility? Did the writer of the first Gospel, or the authors of the remaining three, intend to furnish *a full history* of the Redeemer's ministry on earth? Was *completeness* a part of their design? If they did not mean to compose *an entire biography*, may not Matthew have properly omitted whatever took place in Judea in connection with Jesus? Because the writer was an apostle and eye-witness, was he on that account necessitated to relate *all* he saw and heard; especially when it was no part of his design in writing, to present a complete record of everything done and said by that Person? The idea is preposterous. The argument *a silentio*, is frequently invalid. So we believe it to be in the present case. It is difficult to account for the peculiarity in question. It is not confined however to Matthew, but belongs also to Mark and Luke. It has been conjectured, that it arose from the circumstance of the apostles having first taught in Jerusalem, where it was unnecessary to relate what had happened in the vicinity, but where the events which had occurred in

Galilee were unknown and therefore required to be narrated. This explanation appears very probable.

2. The arrangement of time seems arbitrary (in xiv. 3 it is manifestly erroneous), and arose in part from an original arrangement of materials (xii. 9, comp. Luke vi. 6).

This objection says no more than that the author of the first Gospel has been less observant of time than of other things. He has grouped together sayings and events belonging to different persons and localities, but not so arbitrarily as that no associating principle may be perceived. But the passage xiv. 13 is declared to be without meaning. The word *ἀκούσας* naturally refers to the preceding *ἀπήγγειλαν*, and consequently to the death of the Baptist; while the other evangelists assign a different motive for the retirement of Jesus into the desert, viz. the return of the disciples from their mission. This is the substance of De Wette's statement. The return of the disciples is not specified by Matthew. He omits to notice the event, as it is related in Luke ix. 10. Yet Mark and Luke do not assign the retirement of Jesus into the desert *exclusively* to the return of the apostles from their mission. They relate, that the return occurred immediately before the Master took them apart; but they do not give it as the sole reason of Jesus' withdrawal. Matthew alone furnishes the true motive; viz. the circumstance of John's death, which was brought to the ears of Christ by John's disciples. The apostles returned about the time when the news of John's death reached their Master. Wearied and exhausted as they were, the compassionate Jesus wished to give them rest. Both circumstances may have combined to occasion his departure into a private place. They are not inconsistent. The fear of exposing himself or his disciples to the sanguinary power of Herod, and a benevolent feeling towards their languid energies, united in inducing the Redeemer to go apart with them into an unfrequented place.

3. Some narratives, like that of the rising of several dead (xxvii. 52, etc.), and the bribing of the guards, are pretty generally acknowledged to be unhistorical—not to mention those in which faith in the miraculous comes into play (iv. 1, ff.; xvii. 24, ff.; xxi. 18, ff.).

This argument is pervaded by scepticism in regard to the mira-

culous or extraordinary. It cannot be said, with any degree of probability, that the two verses describing the unusual phenomenon of some persons deceased awaking from their graves and going into Jerusalem, are spurious. Neither external nor internal evidence can be adduced in favour of that hypothesis—advocated as it has been by Stroth[h] and Bauer[i]. Other writers have resorted to a mythic explanation of the event. In the Epistle to the Colossians, and in the Apocalypse, *Christ* is declared to be *the firstborn from among the dead*, and therefore the mythic theory would probably have introduced the passage in the description of Jesus' *resurrection*, not in that of his *death*. It is difficult to conceive of its insertion on mythic principles in the position it now occupies; especially as that very position creates some perplexity. Indeed it is impossible to explain the words consistently with other statements, except by connecting ἐξελθόντες with μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν and supposing that the bodies of the saints were *awakened* from sleep at the time of Christ's dying; but that they did not come forth from their graves till after *he* had risen from the dead. These visitants, extraordinarily raised, must have convinced many Jews that Jesus was the Messiah.

In relation to the credibility of the transaction narrated in xxvii. 62-66, and xxviii. 11-15, strong doubts of it have been entertained by many, such as Stroth, Russwurm[k], Paulus[l], Schulthess[m], Strauss, Kern[n], Weisse[o], Hase[p], Meyer[q], De Wette. The following grounds of suspicion are given by the last named writer as the most tenable: (1.) The difficulty observable in xxvii. 63. (2.) The circumstance of the women who go to the grave knowing nothing of the watch. (3.) The improbability of the members of Sanhedrim making such a request to Pilate, and of the latter acceding to it; particularly of the former having been

[h] In Eichhorn's Repertorium, ix. 123, et seqq.
[i] Biblische Theologie des N. T., vol. i. p. 366.
[k] In Augusti's theol. Monatschrift. 1801. vi. 414 et seqq.
[l] Comment. de custodia ad sepulchrum Jesu disposita, and in his Exegetisches Handbuch, vol. iii. p. 837 ff.
[m] Beschuldigungen des Herren D. Paulus, etc.
[n] Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie. 1834. p. 100 et seqq.
[o] Die evangelische Geschichte, etc. vol. ii. p. 343 et seqq.
[p] Das Leben Jesu, § 122. p. 209.
[q] Kommentar über das Neue Testament; das Evangelium des Matthaeus. Zweite Auflage, p. 480.

so credulous, and having come to a decision so unworthy of them in a meeting of council where men like Gamaliel sat.

To these we offer the following replies:—

(1.) "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said while he was yet alive: 'After three days I will rise again.'" The difficulty is supposed to consist in the fact, that Jesus did not say so publicly and before strangers. In John ii. 19. the Jews gave another interpretation to his words, and Matth. xii. 39. is doubtful. Now it cannot at once be inferred from the silence of all the evangelists, much less from the silence of one, that Jesus did not state publicly and before strangers the fact that he should rise again after three days. Again, though the Jews did not understand many of Christ's utterances when spoken, yet it is not unreasonable to suppose that several of his expressions were particularly impressed on their minds, and either explained by his subsequent teachings, or unfolded by the course of events. When he was put to death, things which he had spoken would be recalled to their recollection, and seen in a new light. Those who heard him speak figuratively of his body, as it is recorded in John ii. 19, did not comprehend the true nature of his statement; but when that body had been consigned to the grave, amid a series of extraordinary occurrences, the statement might readily suggest itself to the memory, and be fully intelligible in the light of recent events. Similar reasoning may be applied to Matth. xii. 39. But apart from all this, it is quite possible to explain the language of the chief priests and Pharisees to Pilate, without supposing that they had heard Jesus speak of his own resurrection after three days. He had intimated the fact to his disciples more than once (Matth. xvi. 21. xvii. 22.), and hence the knowledge of it may have reached the ears of his enemies. They learned this to be one of his statements that, after being put to death, he should rise again the third day.

(2.) The ignorance of the women who visited the sepulchre in relation to the watch that had been set, furnishes no ground for doubting the truth of the fact; for it is highly probable, that they knew nothing of the entire proceedings of the past sabbath. While they were occupied with the services of the sabbath, the proceedings of the Sanhedrists had been privately transacted, and the guard stationed.

(3) We are unable to discover the improbability of the members composing the Sanhedrim repairing to Pilate even on the Sabbath, to prefer their request. Doubtless their consciences were uneasy. They had done a deed of which they could not but think; and the possibility of that deed with all its fearful accompaniments being frustrated, was sufficient to excite their most painful anxiety. What would become of them, were Jesus after all to appear alive again? How could they dare to think of their guilt, if it should be demonstrated, that they had been fighting against a Being on whom heaven had impressed the seal of approbation? The thought was most unwelcome: it made them restless even on their holy day of rest. Hence arose their application to Pilate. The application will appear still more appropriate and natural in their case, even on the Sabbath, if it be thought that they heard but recently the assertion of Jesus concerning his resurrection. The crucifixion was the great theme of conversation at Jerusalem; and, amid current reports, the doctrine of his resurrection, passing from one to another, may have alarmed the chief priests. They would therefore lose no time in applying for a watch. The very possibility of such an event as that of Jesus coming to life again would terrify their guilty consciences, and urge them to any measure likely to allay their fears.

It is impossible to discover the motive that prompted Pilate to accede to their request. Perhaps he was actuated by an uneasiness similar to that which brought the chief priests before him. He had been seized with a superstitious fear, chiefly in consequence of the dreams of his wife; and he was willing to have released the prisoner. He had been anxious to clear himself of the guilt of shedding innocent blood. Whether the fact of his taking water before the multitude and washing his hands—saying, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see ye to it" gave repose to his guilty conscience, may be fairly questioned. But he that could yield to the chief priests and elders, by delivering up Jesus to death, when he would otherwise have released him, could hardly resist the simple request of allowing a watch.

It is farther said, that the members of the Sanhedrim were credulous. They believed the soldiers who brought them information; and even held a formal council at which it was resolved to bribe the

guard. Is this consistent, it is asked, with the decorum of such a college; or, could men like Gamaliel, Joseph of Arimathea, and Nicodemus sanction it? Could the falsehood have escaped Pilate? And is it probable, that he would have concealed it, considering the relation he bore to the Pharisees? These circumstances have so much plausibility, that even Olshausen confesses himself at a loss to deal with them.

There is no foundation for charging the Sanhedrim with credulity, because they listened to the report of the soldiers who kept watch. They knew that the soldiers could not fabricate it, except at the risk of their lives. The circumstances were of a kind to demand belief, however reluctantly that belief may have been entertained. Every thing connected with the appearance of the watch tended at once to impress the minds of the chief priests and scribes with the truthfulness of the account. We are surprised at the notions of dignity attached by some commentators to the college of chief priests and elders. In the unjust and cruel measures they took against the Saviour, they little consulted their dignity. Determined to crush the Nazarene and his cause, they did not hesitate about the means by which their purpose might be accomplished. Dignity, decorum, propriety, weighed nothing in their estimation, when set over against any proceeding which presented a possibility of success. The phrase *συμβούλιον λαβόντες* (xxviii. 12) does not necessarily imply the idea of a *formal, deliberate sitting.* The circumstances were such as to bring them together hastily; and the resolution to bribe the soldiers was the only one they could have adopted consistently with the exigency of the case. To affirm that the falsehood could not have escaped Pilate, is to assume that he took more interest in the matter than his whole character justifies. All his anxiety must have coincided with the measures already taken against the person of Christ, in which he had reluctantly involved himself. And as the story told him by the chief priests and scribes must have been more welcome than the real account of the case would have been, he naturally believed it, and took no farther trouble. Had he heard the true circumstances attendant on Jesus rising from the dead, his fears would have been excited, and his conscience rendered doubly uneasy. Such tidings must have been disagreeable to his

agitated spirit. But when he learned that the body had been stolen by the disciples at night, his fears had not to be allayed, nor were his superstitious feelings to be quieted. He felt that the part he had taken in putting Christ to death was unattended by the guilt and impiety in which it must have presented itself, had Jesus proved himself the Son of God by rising from the dead. Thus the information given by the Sanhedrim to Pilate, false though it was, found a welcome reception. Had he even suspected its truth, he would not have instituted a process of inquiry. Whether Joseph of Arimathea, Nicodemus, and Gamaliel were present at the meeting of the Sanhedrim, is a point that cannot be ascertained. They may or may not have been there. The record is silent on the matter. And if they were present, had they the moral courage to object? Did they possess the boldness necessary to confront the body of the chief priests and elders? And suppose they *did protest* against the unworthy resolution, was it incumbent on the historian to relate the fact? The decision of the majority is the decision of a council. The dissent of a small minority is not usually given. Hence the record is perfectly consistent with the idea of a few persons refusing to sanction the open dissemination of a falsehood.

4. By an oversight in the editor of the Gospel, the same transaction is repeated.

The narratives referred to are those in xii. 22-30 and ix. 32-34. Scheckenburger assumes a traditional mixing up of two different proceedings; while Strauss, followed by De Wette, supposes a double narrative of the same event. The two transactions are similar; but yet they appear to be distinct. In ix. 32, Matthew relates the dispossession of a dumb demoniac *immediately after* the cure of two blind men; for that the two events were directly consecutive is proved by the words *αὐτῶν δὲ ἐξερχομένων ἰδοὺ κ. τ. λ.* which can be referred to none other than the two blind men. Since then the author of the first Gospel marks the time so precisely, it is scarcely possible that he could have related the same occurrence again by mistake at a period quite different. Hence the presumption is, that another event is described in xii. 22 ff. Granting that Luke xi. 14-36 is parallel with Matth. xii. 22-45, which some however deny, there is no contradiction in the

circumstance that the former historian specifies *the dumbness* only, since he does so without denying or excluding *the blindness*. It is true, that in Matthew ix. 32, dumbness alone is specified in the demoniac who was healed; but it is not possible to bring it into identity with Luke xi. 14, etc. The two passages are quite separate and distinct. The astonishment of the multitude, and the blasphemous assertions of the Pharisees after witnessing both dispossessions, are natural in the circumstances, and are appropriately introduced in connection with *similar* events. Those who consider the exactness with which Matthew has marked the time of the one miracle, will not easily allow that he committed a mistake by relating it twice. How could he be so negligent, apart from all supernatural guidance, as to repeat the same miracle on another occasion?

5. Another objection is the want of *graphic* description in one who was an eye-witness, like Matthew. This appears to us a strange objection. It proceeds on the assumption that picturesqueness of delineation belonged to an eye-witness and apostle. The natural abilities and temperament of those called by Christ to be his peculiar associates were not changed by their calling or conversion. They were elevated and spiritualised, but not essentially transformed. Their mental habitudes continued substantially the same, the sinful elements being subdued or removed. When we find, therefore, that Matthew did not possess the faculty of painting, although he was eye-witness of our Lord's actions, all that can be inferred from the fact is, that his mind was not of that peculiar complexion to enable him to draw vivid pictures. Indeed the nature of his occupation was unfavourable to that kind of description. As a collector of taxes, we should not expect much of the picturesque or imaginative from his pen. Accomptants are not ordinarily possessed of the best talents for description. They deal in the exact and formal, in accuracy of detail, or in grouping together what is analogous. Their graphic power is ordinarily feeble. They dispose of their materials with solidity and exactness, but seldom aim at painting a scene. Besides, there is no reason for believing that Matthew was a man of much education. The passage ix. 9 ff. is chosen unfortunately for themselves, by the opponents of the apostolic authorship of the Gospel. How

could the writer speak of himself and the entertainment he gave, after the manner of Mark and Luke? The modesty of the author, so apparent, furnishes a strong argument in favour of the authenticity of the Gospel. He says of himself, "*a man named Matthew*, sitting," etc.; while Mark has, "*Levi, the son of Alphaeus;*" and Luke, "*a publican named Levi.*" Luke says, "*Levi made a great feast in his house,*" while nothing correspondent in expression is found in Matthew. Luke states that "*he left all,*" a circumstance omitted in the first Gospel. Surely the want of graphic power charged on this passage, so far from throwing doubt on the apostolicity of the document, goes to shew that Matthew himself was the writer, because every circumstance which might appear to savour of self-commendation, is suppressed.

6. The evangelist has allowed himself to be led astray, by regarding certain prophecies so as to model the history after them (xxi. 7; xxvii. 3-10; perhaps also verse 39 ff.)

Strauss affirms that Matthew misunderstood the prophecy in Zechariah ix. 9, thinking that two asses were specified in it, the one חמור, the other עיר. It is farther averred, that Matthew, or rather the writer of the Gospel, represents Jesus riding on both at the same time. The latter statement is manifestly incorrect. It is true that *ἐπάνω αὐτῶν* occurs twice in chap. xxi. 7; but the use of the plural does not prove that the rider sat on both together. The expression is a popular one, without being exact. That it is far from being uncommon, may be seen from parallels in Judges, xii. 7, and Genesis, xix. 29. But although it can thus be perfectly justified on the supposition of its reference to *ὄνος* and *πῶλος*, yet we believe that *ἐπάνω αὐτῶν* alludes to the *ἱμάτια*, or garments. It is true that the former *ἐπάνω αὐτῶν* must be referred to the *ὄνος καὶ πῶλος;* but the latter. *ἐπάνω αὐτῶν* is most naturally referred to *ἱμάτια*: *and he sat upon the* GARMENTS. Two animals were brought, a foal and its mother, the latter being probably used in bringing the former. Both were closely related, and more easily led along together. The other evangelists make no mention of the mother-ass; but their silence regarding her does not prove the contradictory character of Matthew's narrative which *does* introduce her.

It was a primary object with the author of the first Gospel, to

shew the exact fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy in the person and proceedings of Christ. Hence he adduces the prediction in Zechariah, in terms not deviating very widely from the original. The *καὶ* between *ὄνον* and *πῶλον* in verse 5 is exegetical: "on an ass, *even* a foal, the son of an ass." So also the ו between חמור and עיר is explanatory. Matthew regarded עיר as epexegetical of חמור, while he introduces *υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου* corresponding to בן־אתנות. He judged it necessary to his design to state, that Christ rode on a young ass which had never been used before, the offspring of a she-ass that had been employed as a beast of burden. This circumstance, trivial as it may appear, had doubtless a reference to the nature of his kingdom. That the Saviour should make his entry into Jerusalem on an animal young, unbroken, strong, comported with the genius of that new kingdom he was about to establish.

In regard to xxvii. 3-10, we cannot admit that the account of Judas there given contradicts that of Luke in the Acts of the Apostles. In various respects it differs, without however presenting a direct *opposition*[r].

It is assumed by De Wette and many others, that the evangelist was misled by Jeremiah xviii. 1, and that he named *him* instead of Zechariah. But we see no ground for the hypothesis. It lacks even the shadow of probability. In every other case the evangelist has quoted correctly, and why should he not have done so in the present? In another work[s] we have endeavoured to shew, that the latter portion of the book now attached to Zechariah, and going by his name, properly belongs to Jeremiah. The very circumstance of his adapting the passage to the purpose for which it is quoted, the changes made in the original words, the departures from the Hebrew and Septuagint, favour the notion that the writer was then wide awake, employing his powers of reflection and discrimination, in the exercise of which he could scarcely have committed so great a blunder as some attribute to him. The confusion in the Greek words of which De Wette speaks, is founded on the change of persons introduced; for, instead of "*I* was prized at," the historian puts "THEY valued," altering the first person singular into the third plural. In the Hebrew, the prophet

[r] See my Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 575. [s] Ibid. pp. 464, 465.

Jeremiah, as a symbolical person acting a symbolical part, appears; whereas the evangelist writes of Christ in the third person, applying to the antitype language used of the type.

7. Several discourses of Jesus are not adduced in true historical connexion (x. 19 ff.; xviii. 8 f., several proverbs contained in the sermon on the mount); others are not even truthfully handed down (x. 23; xii. 39 f.; xx. 16; xxvi. 13; xxviii. 19 f.).

It has been already shewn, that the writer did not mean to place all the events of the evangelical history in their true sequence. This circumstance however forms no objection to *the apostolic* origin of the Gospel usually designated by Matthew's name. As the writer did not intend to record all the occurrences and discourses connected with the Redeemer's sojourn on earth, but simply purposed to give a selection, it need not be assumed or asserted that he meant to follow the regular course of chronological narrative.

But when De Wette and others affirm, that the evangelist has not given a faithful or true record of certain particulars, the charge is so serious as to demand minute examination. We shall glance at the passages adduced to substantiate the accusation. Ch. x. 23.—"But when they persecute you in this city flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come." De Wette refers the coming of Christ in this passage to the return promised in the twenty-fourth chapter, and argues, that the dangers here foretold are not applicable to the state of things represented in that chapter. *There* a point of view is taken which extends over the whole earth; while *in the present case* it is limited to Palestine. Accordingly a conjecture is hazarded, to the effect that the writer had two different sources at his disposal, from which he could draw an account of the Saviour's discourses. In the passage before us he made use of one; in the twenty-fourth chapter of the other. We refer the coming of the Son of Man to the destruction of Jerusalem. The charge delivered to the twelve, immediately before their mission, is much longer in Matthew than in Mark or Luke. Matthew may have transferred to the present occasion much that was subsequently delivered to the apostles; or Mark and Luke may not have described, with the same fulness

as Matthew, every thing spoken at the present time. One thing is certain, that the charge, as given in the first Gospel, refers not only to the first mission on which the apostles were sent forth during the life of Jesus on earth, but also to another, in which higher qualifications should be required, and the whole world comprehended. The entire discourse is so connected and apparently consecutive, that it cannot be separated into two distinct portions which may be supposed to have been spoken at two different times. Admonitions, applicable to the state of the apostles when they were first sent forth to the Jews, and to their state when they should subsequently enter on a wider sphere of activity, are mingled together; so that the Saviour, when first instructing them, had respect to their future life, and passed in his discourse from the one to the other. He comprehended in the one address particular and general precepts, suited at once to their partial errand, and to their universal sphere of operation. In so doing, he was anticipating what should be especially requisite at a different period. Surely in all this there was nothing incongruous.

Ch. xii. 39, etc.—"But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of the prophet Jonas. For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here."

On this passage De Wette observes:—"According to Matthew, the sign of Jonas, in verse 40, is said to have been his abode in the belly of the whale, and the sign which Jesus was about to give that generation, his abode in the heart of the earth. But this explanation is unsuitable, because (1), verse 41 does not agree with it; whereas in Luke, *the preaching* of Jonas, and nothing else, is spoken of. (2) We do not read that the fate of the prophet on the sea had been known to the Ninevites. (3) That was no prophetic sign whatever, but a punishment and a gracious restoration of the rebellious prophet; and as to Jesus himself, he is (4), in verse 41, set above Jonas, not in respect of being a sign,

but in respect of his person or preaching. (5) His resurrection was not a sign to the unbelieving, who had no perception of it, but to the believing."

The same objection, in substance, is presented by Neander[t] who observes, that the allusion to Christ's resurrection in the fortieth verse is quite foreign to the original connection, and to the view with which the *preceding*, as well as the *subsequent* verses were spoken. So, too, many others. These interpreters assert, that Jesus did not mean his own *resurrection*, when he spoke of the sign of Jonas that should be given to the generation then alive, but that he meant his *preaching;* whence they conclude, that the writer of the verse puts an erroneous interpretation of the disciples into the mouth of their Master, in the fortieth verse. It would appear, from Luke xi. 29-31, that Jonas himself was a sign—his person, his public character, his preaching, his entire appearance on earth—although that passage has chiefly respect to his *preaching.* They are thus confirmed in their opinion by the passage in Luke.

(1) We admit, that in the forty-first verse the preaching of Jonas alone is spoken of; but it is not true, *on that account*, that this verse disagrees with the fortieth. In it Christ speaks of what the Ninevites did after *the preaching* of Jonas, *not* of what they did after witnessing *the sign* of the prophet. The topic in the forty-first verse is introduced by Jesus, for the purpose of convicting and silencing his hearers, by shewing them from the example of the Ninevites repenting, the greatness of *their* punishment should *they* continue impenitent after *his* preaching. Thus the fortieth verse speaks of *the sign*, while in the forty-first *another* particular is introduced; viz. the preaching of Jonas.

(2) The preceding remarks effectually dispose of the next particular in the objection, according to which we are informed, that the fate of the prophet on the sea was unknown to the Ninevites. *It is not said* that his fate on the sea was a sign to the Ninevites.

(3) What is the meaning of the expression, the *sign of Jonas?* Does it mean that his fate was a sign to succeeding ages, in being a type of the resurrection of Christ. In this respect we believe it *was* a sign, though we should not confine it to that sole particular.

[t] Leben Jesu, vierte Auflage, p. 422, note 2.

The prophet's miraculous preservation may have been a sign to the men of Nineveh also. It is not improbable that he related the wonderful occurrence to them, though the Old Testament is silent on the subject. The fact of its being a punishment inflicted on the prophet, does not argue its want of being a sign. It may have been both, as it seems to us to have been really intended. Viewed comprehensively, it was *a righteous retribution* on Jonah, and furnished a *warning* or prophetic intimation, to the inhabitants of the city. It bore different aspects towards the prophet himself, and those whom he was commanded to address.

(4) The answer to this particular is contained in the observations already made. Jesus speaks both of the sign of Jonas and of his preaching, the two being different. In the forty-first verse he is placed above the Old Testament prophet in regard to the latter, i. e. his preaching, but *not* in relation to the former, because they are *not identical*, as the objection assumes.

(5) His resurrection was intended for the world at large. As a demonstration of the truth of his religion, it was equally adapted to convince the gainsayer and to confirm the faith of the believer. Thus the allusion to the resurrection appears to us appropriate in the connection. The evil generation wanted some striking manifestation of power on the part of Jesus, that they might be led by it to believe His divine mission. But they were indisposed to believe on Him, even though He should have wrought a notable miracle before their eyes. He had wrought miracles which some of the Scribes and Pharisees had witnessed, or of which they were informed by credible persons; and yet they rejected Him. The entire manifestation of Jesus on earth, till the time at least when this question was put to Him, was a sign; yet because of the blindness and hardness of their hearts, they did not perceive it. Jesus therefore informs them, that one sign for all should afterwards be given them; viz. His resurrection from the dead. If they would not be convinced by it, they should have none other. It is true that it was to be a condemnatory sign to them. This fact however did not lie in the phenomenon itself. It resulted from continued unbelief on their part. The resurrection *might have convinced* them of His Messiahship.

Ch. xx. 16.—"For many are called, but few are chosen." This

phrase is said to have here an unsuitable position, because it belongs to the parable in xxii. 1 ff. The objection seems to have been borrowed from Kern. The clause appears to contain a reason for the preceding statement, "the last shall be first, and the first last." Some think, that the parable was primarily directed against the Jews, who were first called to be the people of God, and stood highest in point of privilege. The Gentiles were last called to be partakers of salvation. The murmuring of those whom the parable describes as first called, because God conferred equal privileges on such as had been called at the eleventh hour, agrees with the character of the Jews, whose envy against the Gentiles was notorious. Nothing indeed could have tended more to mortify their pride, than to see the Gentiles equal partakers of God's grace with themselves. But the first clause of the sixteenth verse shews, that the parable was also intended to have *a general bearing*. The relation between Jews and Gentiles was its primary purport, without excluding analogous cases in all ages. That belonged to a comprehensive class of instances, which all come fairly within scope of the parable. It is given as a leading example; and by means of it parallel cases may be ascertained. "Many who are first in their own estimation, or in that of the world, shall be lowest in God's sight; while others, vile in their own eyes, and disregarded by the world, shall be preferred of Heaven; *for many are called, but few are chosen*," i. e. many persons enjoy the outward call of the Gospel, while few are truly chosen in the divine counsels to eternal life. The clause to which objection is made partakes of the character of a proverb, or general principle, which the writer takes occasion to enunciate in the present connection. It is suitable where it stands; but there are other positions where it might be equally appropriate. The Jews were highly privileged as a nation; yet few of them comparatively made such use of their privileges as to evince their election of God.

The explanation now given is perhaps the most approved one; yet we cannot perceive its exact propriety or adaptation, notwithstanding the degree of plausibility belonging to it. The parable seems rather to refer to labourers *in* "the kingdom of heaven," that is, to persons who have been called at different times into the true Gospel state — to believers in Christ. Under Messiah's

spiritual reign, the first and last called are placed on equal footing, a shorter service not being prejudicial to the real interests of some, nor a longer obedience giving others a claim to higher advantages. Both are alike indebted to free grace for their calling; and therefore they occupy a similar position as respects reward in the sight of God. This principle of equalisation is confirmed and illustrated (γὰρ) by a proposition apparently proverbial, "Many are called, but few are chosen," i. e. "Though many are called to serve Messiah in his kingdom, few are chosen to peculiar distinction in that kingdom." Few among the called are selected for stations of eminent trust, and consequently to *unusual reward.* The ἐκλεκτοὶ belong to the κλητοὶ, but are particularly distinguished among them. Thus the sentence seems applicable to the parable. The words objected to *in this connection* are of *general application*, and may be appropriate in various relations. The objection is obviated at once by Tischendorf's reading, according to which the clause is omitted; but the authorities in favour of expunging it are not sufficient to warrant so bold a step. Even Lachmann has retained it.

Ch. xxvi. 13.—"Verily I say unto you, wheresoever *this* Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her." "Here the evangelist forgets himself, and makes Jesus refer to the Gospel which he was just writing." Fritzsche[u] would expunge τοῦτο, contrary to authority, because it creates the difficulty. There is no reason for supposing that τοῦτο did not proceed from Jesus himself, if εὐαγγέλιον be properly understood in the present connection. It means *the story of my death*, which was indeed *glad tidings* to the world; not *the written Gospel*, which is a sense of the term that is posterior to the New Testament. The verse has no appearance of incongruity in the position it now occupies. It is true that John has nothing corresponding; but Mark gives the same words.

Ch. xxviii. 19.—"*Βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, or *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰ. Χρ.* (Acts viii. 16; ii. 38) denotes baptising with reference to an acknowledgment and confession of the name of Jesus, to bind a

[u] Quatuor evangelia recensuit et commentariis perpetuis edidit, etc. vol. i., Evang. Matth.

person by baptism to believe in Jesus, and to confess that belief. Hence the expression implies the idea of an engagement to believe in Father, Son, and Spirit. But a combination of the threefold view of God implying such reflection, though it might indeed be found in the apostles (2 Cor. xiii. 13), could hardly appear in Christ, and even among the former it could scarcely be exhibited as an object of confession. Besides, in the apostolic period, occasionally at least, all reference in baptism to the Holy Spirit was absent (Acts viii. 16), even though the usual expression, *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰ. Χρ.* be considered as an abbreviation of the one before us, and there be here prescribed, not a formula of baptism, but simply the object of it."

The substance of this objection is also given by Strauss. To refute it fully, it would be necessary to shew the proper nature of baptism as a symbolic ordinance, which cannot be attempted in the present place.

That Jesus meant to prescribe a fixed formula of baptism is not probable. Had such been his design, his words should have been, "Teach all nations, saying, I baptise thee," etc. etc. Nor would the apostles and their assistants have in that case departed from it, and adopted a shorter instead. He rather intended to indicate the common Head of that spiritual organisation under which converts desiring the rite should become bound by new obligations.

After all that has been written, it is exceedingly difficult to settle the precise meaning of the expression *βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πάτρος, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, "to baptise into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." Perhaps De Wette assigns it too much meaning, when it is made to involve an express obligation to receive the doctrine of a Triune God as a direct object of faith. The primary idea of it, as far as we can gather from similar phrases in the New Testament, seems to be this, that the person baptised is supposed to adopt the system of religion in which the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost occupy the pre-eminent position,—to come into a state of subordination to the laws of Christianity. The Father is specified, because the Son revealed him under the new economy; the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as He was promised by the Redeemer to

the disciples. In professing to adopt the Son as their Teacher and Law-giver, the baptised could not avoid a recognition of the Father, by whom He had been sent, or of the Holy Spirit, who was to take the things of Christ and apply them to the heart. Whether the commission implied so much as should authorise the persons administering baptism to require a distinct profession of faith in the essential unity and coequality of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is doubtful. We cannot suppose that the apostles baptised none except such as solemnly devoted themselves at the time to the service of the Sacred Trinity, or gave themselves up by solemn covenant "to God the Father as their Father, reconciled by Christ; and to Christ as their Saviour, and the Holy Ghost as their Sanctifier." Perhaps they did not demand or expect a definite, formal avowal of belief in the doctrine of the Trinity. Those who submitted to baptism virtually professed, by their desire for initiation into a Christian church, to adopt the religious system, and to be subject to the laws of the Son. This is probably all that the apostles and their companions inculcated on the baptised, or that they would have required from them had they reason to think that any desiring to be admitted within the pale of Christianity were not proper subjects of baptism.

These observations may serve to shew the unreasonableness of the objection founded on the so called formula of baptism. It is of no importance to adduce Acts viii. 16, where all reference to the Holy Spirit is wanting, because we do not believe in the invariableness of the words, nor in the possibility of a person receiving the Son as his Law-giver and Teacher without an acknowledgment of the Spirit as proceeding from the Father and the Son. Baptism had been practised during the ministry of our Lord. It was not instituted *now*. Yet it was befitting the Author of the Christian religion to give a *solemn* and *public* sanction to the rite, immediately before he ascended, by indicating its general object and providing for its perpetuity. It is true that He does not condescend to point out the specific nature and design of the symbolic ordinance before us. He simply mentions the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as claiming submission from the baptised. But no one who views the institution aright will fail to mistake its implied reference to the Spirit, because He is set forth

as the Agent whose office is to apply the atonement of Christ to the purification of the soul.

8. "We find great obscurity with respect to the Messianic dignity attributed to himself by Jesus; and there is a contradiction between the sermon on the mount, which rests on the basis that Jesus was the Messiah, and xvi. 16." It will be apparent to the attentive reader of the Gospels, that the true character of Jesus was gradually revealed. His Messianic dignity was always indeed presupposed, but not made prominent. His divine attributes were not intended to be conspicuously manifested in the days of His flesh. There is no contradiction between the sermon on the mount and Matthew xvi. 16. The verb *ἀποκαλύπτειν* is used in relation to a thing already known, in various places of the New Testament (Matt. xi. 25; Gal. i. 16; Ephes. i. 17), and need not therefore, on the present occasion, be taken to denote *the unfolding of a thing for the first time.* For aught we can tell, Jesus may have previously made disclosures of His Messianic dignity to the disciples. Indeed the Gospels contain various intimations that the Messianic dignity was known from the commencement of His ministry. At the first passover he says, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up;" and if there was no desire to conceal His Messiahship in the sermon on the mount, why should it have been previously kept in the background? Or, Peter may have addressed Jesus as *the Messiah* before, without attaching definite or correct ideas to that appellation. It is *the mode* in which he confessed Jesus to be the Messiah at this critical period, which evinces a new perception of the Master he followed. Probably the notions previously entertained of Him, in the character of the promised Messiah, were largely the offspring of Peter's own mind—the result of his own reflection—tinged no doubt with the sensuous and the earthy; but the present confession resulted from the revelation of the Spirit. This objection has been urged by Scheckenburger, Strauss, De Wette, and others, without effect.

9. Ch. xv. 29-39.—The similarity of the transaction recorded in this place to that related in xiv 13 ff., has been thought to indicate, that one and the same fact is narrated in both. The minor details alone are different; and it is pronounced incredible

that the same occurrence should have been repeated within so short an interval, without any allusion of the disciples, on the second occasion, to the first. Such is the view of Schleiermacher[x], Schulz[y], Kern, Credner[z], Hase, Strauss, Neander, and De Wette. The last named writer attaches particular weight to the thirty-third verse, where, as he thinks, the doubting question of the disciples is wholly unintelligible after the first miraculous feeding of the multitudes, however great their obtuseness may have been.

In reply to these objections we remark, that Mark has likewise related both miracles; so that there are two witnesses to their separateness. But it is alleged, that Mark is dependent on Matthew in this instance, and falls accordingly into the same error. The two passages in Matt. xvi. 9 f. and Mark viii. 19 f., when compared, appear to us to present insuperable difficulty to the proposed identification of the miracles. In the ninth and tenth verses of Matthew's Gospel, sixteenth chapter, and in the nineteenth and twentieth verses of Mark's Gospel, eighth chapter, the miracles are clearly referred to by Jesus as separate and distinct. De Wette perceiving the difficulty says, that this address of Jesus to His disciples must be supposititious, or else it requires to be strongly modified. Such is the expedient to which the hypothesis leads—an expedient that arbitrarily sets aside certain utterances of the Redeemer to which no objection can be taken, except their standing in the way of a peculiar hypothesis. In Matthew's Gospel, xv. 32, we find these words: "Then Jesus called his disciples unto Him and said, I have compassion on the multitude because they continue with me now three days and have nothing to eat: and I will not send them away fasting, lest they faint in the way." It was natural for the disciples to infer from this language, that he did not intend to work a miracle again in feeding the multitude. He had allowed them to remain three days with Him in the retired district, without supplying their physical wants. Hence the disciples express astonishment at His words, and reply, "Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness, as to fill so great a multitude?" His own language had led them to think that he did not purpose to work a miracle, as on a former occasion;

[x] Ueber Lucas, p. 137. [y] Die Lehre vom Heil. Abendmahl, p. 311.
[z] Einleitung in das N. T., p. 199.

else he would not have delayed it so long; and accordingly their reply, taking the interrogative form, betrays their wonder. But when Jesus questions them more minutely as to the quantity of bread they had—"How many loaves have ye?"—their simple answer was, "Seven, and a few little fishes." Here is no astonishment; for the thought had now entered their minds that He was about to work a miracle. They wonder no more, but simply reply to His question, and prepare to obey His commands.

10. The baptism of Jesus, as narrated in the first Gospel, in comparison with John's account of the same event, has been adduced against the apostolic composition of the former (iii. 13-17).

The words, "I have need to be baptised of thee, and comest thou to me?" says de Wette, presuppose that John is acquainted with Jesus: not exactly that he recognises in him the Messiah, but yet that he judges him far superior to himself, and fitter to be initiated into the kingdom of God. On the contrary, the Baptist says (John i. 31), he did not know Jesus before the baptism. To understand these words as meaning he did not know Him as the Messiah, but was well acquainted with him in other respects, is contrary to exegetical simplicity. Hence, with Lücke and Strauss, we must assume a contradiction between Matthew and John, to the disadvantage of the former.

There can be no hesitation in affirming, that the testimony of John the Baptist, in the 29th and subsequent verses of the first chapter of John's Gospel, was given *after* the baptism of Jesus; while the verb ἤδειν and others in the same connection point to a past event. John did not know Christ before the latter came to be publicly baptised. He did not know Him personally. They had probably never met. Their lives had been spent apart;—that of Jesus in private retirement at Nazareth, that of John in a remote and mountainous district. But yet the words of Matthew, iii. 14, imply *some* knowledge of Jesus on the part of John before the former's public baptism. Here therefore it must be assumed, that God pointed Him out to John, by an inward revelation, as the distinguished Person whose office was to baptise with the Holy Ghost. In a similar way, a knowledge of Saul, and likewise of David, was communicated to Samuel. The recognition implied

by the descent of the Holy Ghost *followed* the baptism; so that John must have previously obtained direct assurance from above, that Jesus was the Messiah.

11. Another objection is drawn from the account given of Christ's temptation in the wilderness; which, in the present form of it, says De Wette, cannot be historical.

A full consideration of this topic belongs to the commentator rather than the writer of an Introduction. The only plausible method in which the narrative can be adduced against the apostolic origin of the first Gospel, is by insisting on its *unhistorical* form. But before the charge be advanced, some satisfactory explanation of its nature should be given by the objector. He should clearly shew, *in what precisely* the unhistorical character of the narration consists. We admit that *the literal* acceptation of the paragraph presents very great, if not insuperable difficulties. Nor among the numerous attempts which have been made to unravel this mysterious part of the evangelical history, has any view been given which is not open to several objections. * Inward suggestions present the usual enticements to sin. This being the ordinary course of Divine Providence, the most natural interpretation is that which accords with it. Assuming then that the series of temptations was internal, though represented in the outward form of action, *the subjective reality* justifies the living external representation. A certain train of thought, embodying the current but incorrect views of the times, suggested itself to the spotless mind of Jesus, which He at once repelled without harbouring. It is scarcely possible to realise the nature and severity of this trial, without having distinct ideas of the manhood of Jesus. He possessed all the natural feelings of the human heart. He was about to enter on public life. His contemporaries associated certain ideas with Messiah. They expected that He would be clothed with extraordinary authority. They thought that He would be endued with supernatural powers. They looked for a temporal prince wielding the powers with which he was invested for his own advantage, relieving his wants, protecting himself from injury, gratifying his own desires, and exalting himself to the highest earthly dominion. These were the sentiments of the time, which constituted the chief elements of the suggestions presented to the mind of Jesus. The ideas were art-

fully chosen, and were directed in some inexplicable way by the powers of darkness against the sinless soul of the Redeemer. They formed the most powerful assault that could have been made upon Him, at the very crisis of His history, when he was about to appear in his public character, and found Himself in a position which opened up prospects of the greatest magnificence—the mysterious possession of the Divine nature. The time and place are real and literally correct. Jesus was in the wilderness, preparing Himself by inward meditation for the great work of His public ministry. Surely the description, viewed in this light, is quite in keeping with the Hebrew style. A parallel may be found in the case of some Old Testament prophets, such as Hosea. According to the present interpretation, we obtain a narrative which is certainly historical in part, although wanting, perhaps, in *such* a historical character as many wish to find in it[a].

12. Matthew xvii. 24-27.

(1) "The miracle, whether it be one of power or of knowledge, is very unnecessary, since he might have received a *stater* in a natural way. It is, moreover, unworthy of Jesus, because on no other occasion does he call his power of working miracles into exercise for himself (comp. iv. 4).

(2) The miracle presupposes something utterly impossible, viz. that the fish should have had the piece of money in its mouth, for when a fish swallows any thing it does not stay in the mouth, but descends into the stomach.

(3) It is also against the assumption of a miracle that the consequence is not alluded to. It is not said, as in the case of other miracles, that Peter "did and found as Jesus had commanded."

We should scarcely have ventured to adduce these arguments, or to consider them separately, were it not that Olshausen has been greatly perplexed with the difficulties of the passage, and by no means satisfied with any explanation he could himself furnish in opposition to Paulus and Strauss.

(1) Was a miracle unnecessary? So it is affirmed, because the money might have been easily procured without the aid of the

[a] See a very able essay on this topic by Ullmann, in his Treatise Die Sündlosigkeit Jesu, fourth edition, Appendix; and also De Wette's condensed view of the different views which have been taken of it in his Commentary on Matthew, third edition, pp. 48-50.

supernatural. It must be allowed that Jesus had no money at the time. It is possible to conceive that He would have taken gifts had they been freely offered Him, because he was continually doing good to the bodies and souls of men with the most disinterested benevolence. The perfect majesty and propriety of His nature would not have rejected the spontaneous offerings of those who were receiving far higher benefit from Him. But we can scarcely conceive that it would have comported with the dignity of His person or the decorum of His character, to ask or borrow money from men. The Son of the Most High, the Lord of heaven and earth, would have been lessened in his appearances among men beneath His true position, had he resorted to asking.

Was the miracle unworthy of Jesus, because he never exerted His miraculous power on behalf of Himself? If the case be attentively considered, it will be found perhaps that the miracle was not wrought for Himself.

The reasoning addressed to Peter renders it apparent that the tribute was a religious one, levied for the service of the temple from every male above twenty years of age, once in the year. When he came to Capernaum, the collectors of this tax applied to Peter the spokesman of the apostles, asking him whether his Master paid the customary theocratic tribute? They thought perhaps, that Jesus might naturally claim exemption from its payment, on the ground of his desire to be considered the Messiah. It is difficult to discover the exact state of Peter's mind when he answered the collectors in the affirmative. At the time of transfiguration, which immediately preceded the present incident, he had exalted ideas of the nature and person of Jesus, recognising in Him the promised Messiah; but he and his companions were exceedingly sorrowful when informed of the betrayal, sufferings, and death of the Son of Man. The latter revelation might weaken the conceptions entertained of the Divine nature of Jesus; and hence Peter might suppose that his Master would pay the tax, just as he fulfilled every duty required by the law of Moses. Hence the incident to which Peter's forward haste in returning an affirmative answer for his Master gave rise, was employed to serve an important purpose. It was made the instrument of convincing the disciple, that although, as the Son of God,

the Messiah was justly exempt from payment of the theocratic tribute, he condescended to that humble duty all the more readily, that his enemies, who did not acknowledge his Messiahship, might be deprived of a pretext for accusing him of neglecting the law. If the sons of kings pay no tribute to their fathers; much less should the Son of Israel's King render pecuniary support to the maintenance of a worship which was only preparatory to His coming. The Saviour intended at once to shew the relation He bore to the theocracy, His condescension in fulfilling all righteousness, and His omnipotent power. He meant to impress the mind of Peter in particular with a deeper consciousness of the Master's Messianic dignity, because that mind, ready to lose an abiding hold of the great truth, seemed to have almost let it go on the present occasion.

(2) That the transaction supposes something impossible can only be allowed by such as determine *a priori* to reject all miraculousness in it. Peter was commanded to betake himself to his former craft for procurement of the necessary money, while the omniscience of Jesus had foretold, and His omnipotence arranged the event. The first fish taken was to have a piece of money in its mouth. To affirm that the coin should have been in the stomach, because fishes immediately swallow what they take into their mouth, is virtually to deny the miracle beforehand.

(3) The account of the incident is apparently incomplete. The narrative terminates somewhat abruptly. But because the accomplishment of miracles is noticed on other occasions, it does not follow that absolute uniformity should be pursued in the mode of description.

13. Matthew xxi. 18-22.—Most interpreters view the deed here recorded as invested with *a symbolical* character. As bearing an allegorical aspect, it is worthy of Jesus; whereas exceptions have been made to His character, if we regard Him simply as cursing an innocent fig-tree. The symbolical actions of the Old Testament prophets, by which they illustrated or confirmed their predictions, favour this view. But there is a difference of opinion concerning the spiritual import of the act. Many suppose that Jesus meant to call attention to the ruin of the Jewish nation, now spiritually unfruitful. For this purpose they compare the

59283

parable in Luke xiii. 6, which may have been delivered at the same time. But his subsequent words suggest a different and preferable view of the action. It was designed to be another proof of His power to the disciples, and a means of strengthening their feeble faith. If their Master exhibited such command over the powers of nature, how were they encouraged to place unlimited confidence in Him, and in the moral efficacy of His doctrine. In view of the dangers that surrounded them, this impressive act was fitted to call forth their highest faith in His ability to save from every foe, whether human or spiritual. De Wette objects to the symbolic character of the action, because there is no intimation of it in the Gospels; but surely the parable of the barren fig-tree in Luke's Gospel, as well as Jesus' own words, after pronouncing the doom of the tree, suggest a moral import. That the narrative was traditionally developed out of *the parable*, is an arbitrary assumption on the part of Strauss and Hase.

14. Another objection advanced against Matthew's Gospel, is founded on the account it gives of the time when our Saviour celebrated the Last Supper. This lies equally against Mark and Luke, who coincide with the first Gospel in their narrative of the transaction. On the present occasion, it comes before us as militating against the first Gospel.

It is alleged then, that the synoptical Gospels represent Jesus as celebrating the Passover on the evening after the fourteenth of Nisan, so that he was crucified on the fifteenth; while John states that he was crucified on the fourteenth day of the same month, his crucifixion thus preceding the legal time of the Jewish paschal supper. In the former case, the Supper of which our Lord partook the night before he suffered, was the ordinary paschal supper of the Jews; in the latter, the feast of the Passover was not yet come. Thus according to many there is an express contradiction, John being supposed to give the correct statement, and the writer of the first Gospel an erroneous one. The most recent expositors of the New Testament, such as Lücke[b], Meyer, and De Wette, insist on the irreconcilableness of the two accounts, while all admit the exceeding difficulty of the question.

[b] Commentar über das Evang. des Johan. vol. ii., 3d edition, p. 714, et seqq.

The argument consists of the following separate points, to each of which it is necessary to attend:—

It should be remarked by way of introduction, that the first three Gospels render it certain that our Lord partook of the Jewish paschal supper the night before he suffered. We take it for granted also, that the same supper is spoken of in John xiii. 1, etc., notwithstanding the opinion of Lightfoot[c], Wolf[d], and others, after Origen, that John there speaks of an earlier meal in Bethany. All the concomitant circumstances related in the fourth Gospel shew, that the writer speaks of the same supper which the three synoptical Gospels describe.

1. "Now *before the feast of the Passover*, when Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end. And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him," etc. (John xiii. 1, 2). Here the last meal is said to be *before* the Passover. Hence it could not be the legal paschal supper.

2. "And it was *the preparation of the Passover*, and about the sixth hour: and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King!" (xix. 14). Here, the morning *after* the supper—the day on which Christ suffered—is called *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*.

3. "Some of them thought because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of *against the feast*," etc. (xiii. 29). Here during the last meal the feast of the Passover is supposed to be future.

4. "Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment, and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment-hall, lest they should be defiled; but *that they might eat the Passover*" (xviii. 28). Here the Jews would not enter the praetorium lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover. Hence it is concluded that the paschal supper was future, not past.

5. "The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain on the cross on the Sabbath-day

[c] Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae in Matth. xxvi. 6.
[d] Curae Philolog. et Criticae, vol. ii., p. 934.

(for that Sabbath-day was an high-day), besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away" (xix. 31). The day after the crucifixion, which was the Jewish Sabbath, is here called *a great day*, because it coincided with the fifteenth of Nisan, which was the first day of the festival.

6. "But ye have a custom, that I should release unto you one at the Passover: will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews?" (xviii. 39). Here Pilate speaks of the Passover as near its commencement, or just begun, but certainly not yet past.

7. According to the Talmudists, it was unlawful to perform any judicial act on the Sabbath, or any great festival day; and yet the examination, the judgment, and the execution of Jesus are said to have taken place on that day.

These particulars are not alike strong or important in proof of that for which they have been adduced. Some rely most on the first; others, on the fourth. Both are certainly formidable; and it is not surprising that they have seemed irresistible to many minds. But yet we are inclined to believe, that the accounts of Matthew and John are not at variance. Perhaps the discrepancy may be found *apparent*, not *real* or *irreconcilable*. It were very strange indeed that John, who was present at the last meal, should mistake the time of it; and still more so that he should have assigned it to a different day from the three evangelists, after whom he certainly wrote. Such culpable ignorance or negligence would be singular in a writer like John, who alone marks the Passovers which our Lord attended, and who seldom swerves from chronological order.

Let us now examine the separate testimonies adduced.

1. With regard to the construction of John xiii. 1, 2, some think that the sentence beginning with the first verse ends with the fourth, the second εἰδώς referring back to and resuming the first. But the great majority of critics regard the first verse as an independent sentence, constituting an introduction or preface to what follows. In this manner the construction is less intricate, and certainly more natural. De Wette allows, that, according to the principles of strict grammar, the first verse stands by itself, but speaks of a logical necessity which will admit of no pause there,

demanding a continuation of the thought; so that the subsequent verses must be joined in idea with the first, however separate they may appear at first sight. The learned author is probably right in affirming a logical connection between the parts just specified, —a connection virtually the same as that subsisting between a preface and what immediately succeeds it.

Much depends on the sense of the phrase *εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτοὺς*. *Εἰς τέλος*, judging by analogy, should be translated *unto the end*, not *at the last;* while the verb *ἠγάπησε* denotes, *he exhibited his love* unto them to the end. According to this interpretation, the phrase *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα* particularly qualifies *εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς*; and the verb itself makes it apparent that the preposition in this case is limited to *time immediately before*, else *ἐλήλυθεν* could hardly be used. Hence *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς* is equivalent to *ἐν τῷ προεορτίῳ*, as Bochart[e] and Frischmuth[f] long ago perceived. We do not, however, agree with them in explaining *ἐν τῷ προεορτίῳ* as including a part of the festival itself. Lampe's[g] observations against that exposition have no small weight. The phrase in question rather refers particularly to the evening commencing the fifteenth day of Nisan. Strictly speaking, the paschal supper formed the commencement of the festival, and was reckoned to the fifteenth day as its opening rite; but, at the same time, there is a perfect propriety in speaking of the paschal supper and the festival of unleavened bread as distinct. They are distinguished in Numbers, xxviii. 16, 17. Thus the phrase denotes the preparatory evening of the festival.

2. Here *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα* is explained, the preparation or eve of the first Passover day which was a Sabbath day. *Παρασκευή*, it is said, corresponds to the Hebrew עֶרֶב; and as עֶרֶב הַפֶּסַח is the evening before the Passover, so *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα* is the preparatory day of the Passover.

By consulting the usage of *παρασκευὴ*, we shall find it everywhere denoting the preparation of the Jewish Sabbath. In Mark, xv. 42, an explanation is subjoined, *ὅ ἐστι προσάββατον*, which refers it precisely to Friday. Hence the expression is equivalent to *σάββατον ἐν τῷ πάσχα*, just as in Ignatius to the Philippians, c. 13, *σάββατον τοῦ πάσχα* is equivalent to *σάββατον ἐν τῷ πάσχα*.

[e] Hieroz. lib. ii. c. 50. [f] Ad Matt. xxvi. 2.
[g] Commentarius Evang. Joann. vol. iii. p. 3, note.

Similar modes of expression occur in Socrates and Hippolytus. It is incorrect to say that παρασκευὴ corresponds to עֶרֶב, since the latter was the common and well-known designation of Friday. It is equivalent to the Talmudic ערובתא. Had the day before the festival been here meant, we should have expected, according to analogy, προεόρτιος or προέορτος, which is found in Philo. "There is a twofold difficulty in referring John's language to a preparation or *eve* of the regular Passover: *first*, because apparently no such eve or preparation did or could well then exist; and, *secondly*, because it being then the sixth hour, or midday, the eve or time of preparation (supposing it to exist) had not yet come, and the language was therefore inapplicable. But if John be understood as here speaking of the weekly παρασκευὴ or προσάββατον, which was a common name for the whole of Friday, then the mention of the sixth hour was natural and appropriate."[h]

3. If it be recollected that ἑορτὴ denotes *the festival*, and not *the paschal meal*, there will be no difficulty in these words. The evening preceding and introducing the fifteenth of Nisan had now arrived; the paschal supper had been made ready; and it was time to buy the things required for the following days. "If now our Lord's words were spoken on the evening preceding and introducing the fifteenth of Nisan they were appropriate, for it was already quite late to make purchases for the following day. But if they were uttered on the evening preceding and introducing the fourteenth of Nisan, they were not thus appropriate; for then no haste was necessary, since a whole day was to intervene before the festival."[i]

4. This argument is valid only on the supposition that πάσχα denotes *the paschal sacrifice*. It is true that φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα is used elsewhere only of eating the paschal supper; but the word πάσχα by itself is not always so restricted, and need not be limited in the present instance. On the contrary, it is taken, in a wider sense, for the whole festival of seven days, Matt. xxvi. 2; Luke xxii. 1. This is accordant with the usage of the word פֶּסַח, at least in Deuteron. xvi. 2, and 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, 8, 9. If, then, τὸ πάσχα be employed in a wider sense, embracing the whole seven days of unleavened bread, φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα may mean,

[h] Robinson in his Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek, p. 220.
[i] Robinson in the Bibliotheca Sacra for 1845, p. 425.

partaking of the peace-offerings and thank-offerings which were presented during the paschal festival, and properly on the fifteenth day of the month. These were called the *Chagigah.*

Thus the eucharistic offerings made on the fifteenth, which were closely connected with the paschal supper, are here denoted metonymically by the term πάσχα, as Lightfoot[k] and Bynaeus[l] formerly shewed. The same writers have also proved, that the defilement which the chief priests and members of the Sanhedrim would have contracted by entering the house of a heathen, belonged to the class of impurities which might be done away in the evening. If then the Jews, as is alleged, were expecting to partake of *the paschal supper* in the evening, the circumstance of entering the house of a heathen need not have given them any anxiety, because they might have washed themselves in the evening and been clean, for the purpose of partaking of the meal which was eaten after sun-set.

5. The epithet *great* prefixed to the paschal Sabbath, may have belonged to it for other reasons than the coincidence of the first festival day with such a Sabbath. It will agree equally well with the sixteenth of Nisan, both because the regular weekly Sabbath fell upon that day, and also because it was the feast of first-fruits. Had the words of John been ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων ἡ μεγάλη, they must have been referred to the fifteenth of Nisan; but as they now stand, various reasons justify the writer in assigning the epithet *great* to the sixteenth of Nisan, the second day of the paschal festival.

6. This argument derives all its force from the assumption that the word πάσχα is taken in the restricted sense of *paschal meal.* It has been already shewn, that it is commonly used in the New Testament to denote the whole festival of unleavened bread—*the entire paschal festival.* The words in question mean *during* the paschal festival. It was probably on the fifteenth of Nisan that the criminal was released.

7. Movers[m] has exhibited great industry in setting forth this objection, and collecting the passages from the Talmud which appear to support it. In answering it, it will be proper to observe, that notwithstanding the sanctity belonging to a festival day,

[k] Horae Hebraicae in Joh. xviii. 28. [l] De Morte Jesu Christi, lib. iii. c. 1.
[m] Zeitschrift für phil. und kathol. Theol. 1833. Heft. 7, 8.

there was still a distinction between *a Sabbath-day* and any festival-day. The former was regarded as holier than the latter. Things might be done on the latter, which were not allowable on the former. Even on the first and last days of festivals, things might be done which were absolutely prohibited on the Sabbath.

In consequence of the Talmudical examples, some of which favour the assumption on which the objection rests, while others oppose it, Strauss has narrowed and modified the whole to the position, that criminals might be executed during the intermediate days of the festival, but probably not on the first and last days. But the prohibitions quoted from the Talmud do not forbid public judicial acts on the Sabbath and on festival days. That adduced by Lücke from Tract. Yom. Tob. c. 5, with an additional instance taken by Movers from Tr. Shabbath, c. 1, § 2, are not *absolute prohibitions*, as they contain a reference to circumstances in the manner of conducting the judicial process. Another passage brought forward from the Babylonian Gemora by Lightfoot, and seized upon by Movers, alludes to trials *of a certain kind.* Two passages, Tr. Sanhed, c. 10, and Mishna Sanhed, 10, 4, plainly prove that judicial acts might take place on Sabbath and festival days. Nor do they make any distinction between the first festival day or the last, and the others[n].

Besides, it is matter of doubt whether these Talmudical precepts were in force in the time of the New Testament, or whether they were not enacted at a subsequent period. And even if such acts as the members of the Sanhedrim performed towards Jesus on the first day of the paschal week were not lawful, who shall affirm that the councillors were so scrupulous in attending to the laws, as not to violate them through hatred of one whom they considered a blasphemer. Every thing in their conduct on other occasions leads to the conclusion, that they would not have hesitated to break through their own canons for the sake of injuring the Saviour, or of putting him to death. We find them alleging as a ground why Jesus should not be taken and put to death on a feast-day, not the sanctity of the festival, but the danger of an uproar among the people (Matth. xxvi. 5). And on the

[n] See Tholuck's Kommentar zum Evang. Joh. sixth edition, pp. 304, 305.

last great day of the Feast of Tabernacles, the Sanhedrim sent officers to apprehend him (John vii. 32, 37, 44, 45).

In taking a general survey of these objections it will be seen, that they rest for the most part on certain interpretations requiring previous justification; or they are based on the supposed contradiction between the first Gospel and some one of the others, particularly John or Luke, *the error being charged to the first.* Not one of them has found universal acceptation even in Germany; as De Wette confesses; while the same writer candidly allows that they do not unitedly disprove the apostolic composition of the Gospel *in respect to its body and substance.* We could admit the authenticity of the Greek Gospel, and yield up several of the passages to which objection has been made. We might subtract them from the document, and abide by the rest as apostolic. In this way we should merely lose a few places supposed to be objectionable in consequence of their containing *unhistorical, traditional, mythic* materials. We might allow that one thing has been made double, as in the case of the feeding of the multitudes; that different things are assimilated and made one; that a proverbial expression has been inserted in a wrong place; that a fact narrated savours of the superstitious or apocryphal peculiar to a later period than that of the apostle Matthew. We might say that the present Gospel is not *absolutely* apostolic, but only *relatively* so. We might affirm that the elements it now contains proceeded from an apostle, but some of them not *in the form* they have at present. *The whole Gospel, in its present form,* might be refused apostolic origin. We might first be required to separate the body of it from the fabulous and mythic elements incorporated with that body. But before making these concessions, or yielding to the pressure of such demands, we must know *the precise criterion* by which *the unhistoric, the traditional,* and *the mythic* are to be determined. If by a disbelief of miracles, because they are impossible, as Strauss thinks, we cannot assent to suspect or discard a narrative on this account, since *it remains to be proved* that a miracle is an impossible thing. If the criterion be the Gospel of John, we ask, by what right is every thing brought to this tribunal? When will the balancing of one Gospel against another cease to be practised; or to what stable result can it ever

lead? If we exalt *Luke*, as Schleiermacher does, we shall depreciate Matthew, after the fashion of that speculative theologian. If, on the other hand, *Matthew* be taken as the perfect standard, *Luke* will be depreciated. It is totally wrong to set Gospel against Gospel in this manner, giving the preference to one because we have assumed it to be the model°. Shall we make our own subjective views the criterion? If so, the Gospel of Matthew will be the play-thing of caprice in many instances. When a passage is discovered to be wholly inappropriate in the connection it occupies, the fact must be *proved* rather than resolved into *one's own views* of appositeness. When there is something apocryphal or mythic, other reason for pronouncing it such must be *shewn* than *I think so*. On the whole, we fear that in discovering and separating the objectionable elements of the Gospels, many critics have exalted their *own notions* to an *undue* prominence. Nothing indeed can be of apostolic origin, that does not agree with *reason*; nor can any narrative be justly attributed to an apostle that is incongruous with his office, habits, or character; but the greatest care should be taken in settling, on a solid basis, *what is reason*, and *what is congruous* or *incongruous* with a certain apostle in his peculiar circumstances. And yet such caution has not been exercised. Hasty theories have sprung up, only to give place to others. Perhaps when the Gospel of Matthew shall be farther examined and sifted, the influence of tradition upon it will be less perceptible; and the unhistorical circumstances supposed to have been incorporated with its texture may dwindle down into nothingness. Then may the apostle himself, in connection with the person who put his Aramaean Gospel into Greek, be permitted to enjoy undisputed authorship. We do not despair of seeing such a result for the Gospel before us when viewed in the light of the most rigid exegesis under the guidance of an impartial spirit. Placed by the side of the third and fourth, we neither wish it to be exalted above them, nor to be subordinated to them; for after all dissentient passages are put in juxta-position with no other object than to ascertain whether they *really* clash, or harmoniously unite, the

° See Baur's kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, p. 619.

severest test will prove unable to dispossess any one of them from its apostolic place or purpose.

VI. Integrity.

The first two chapters were considered an integral part of the Gospel till the middle of the eighteenth century, when Williams[p] attacked their authenticity. He was followed by Stroth[q], Hess[r], Ammon[s], Eichhorn[t], Schleiermacher[u], Bertholdt[x], Norton[y], Priestley[z], etc., who, if they did not absolutely reject, threw out doubts at least of the apostolic origin of the two chapters. The portion, however, has not wanted advocates, such as Fleming[a], Velthusen[b], Thiess[c], Rau[d], Geo. Ph. Schmidt[e], Piper[f], Griesbach[g], Schubert[h], Müller[i], Hug[k], Credner[l], Paulus[m], Fritzsche[n], Kuinoel[o], and others. We shall briefly glance at the evidence, on the strength of which the chapters have been reckoned spurious.

1. Epiphanius states, that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which was the original Aramaean production of Matthew, began with the account of John's baptism, chap. iii. 1. *Ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίου ἔχει· ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας, κ. τ. λ.*

[p] A Free Inquiry into the Authenticity of the First and Second Chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel. 1771. 8vo.
[q] In Eichhorn's Repertorium, vol. ix. p. 99, et seqq.
[r] Bibliothek der Heil. Geschichte i. p. 208, et seqq.
[s] De Luca Emendatore Matthaei. 1805.
[t] Einleitung, vol. i. sec. 100, p. 461, et seqq.
[u] On Luke, p. 49, et seqq., English translation.
[x] Einleitung, sec. 333, p. 1270, et seqq.
[y] Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels, vol. i. notes.
[z] History of Early Opinions, vol. iv., p. 102, et seqq.
[a] Free Thoughts upon a Free Enquiry, etc. 1771. 8vo.
[b] The Authenticity of the First and Second Chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel vindicated. 1771. 8vo.
[c] De Evangelii Matthaei integritate interpolando non corrupta. 1782. 4to.
[d] Symbola ad quaestionem de authentia cap. i. et ii. Evang. Matthaei, etc. 1793. 4to.
[e] Ueber die beiden ersten Kapitel des Matthaeus, etc., 1790, 8vo; to whom may be added *J. F. Schmid*, in his Examen integritatis duorum priorum capitum Evangelii Matthaei, etc. 1791 4to.
[f] De genuina auctoritate capitis primi et secundi evang. S Matthaei. 1779. 4to.
[g] Epimetron ad Commentarium criticum in Matthaei textum ii. p. 47, et seqq.
[h] De infantiae Jesu Christi historiae, etc. commentatio. 1815. 8vo.
[i] Ueber die Aechtheit der zwei ersten Kapitel, etc. 1830. 8vo.
[k] Einleitung, 4th edition, vol. ii. sec. 74, p. 235, et seqq.
[l] Einleitung, etc. p. 63, et seqq.
[m] Exeget. Handbuch, vol. i. p. 137, et seqq.
[n] Commentarius, etc. Excursus iii.
[o] Prolegomena, sec. 6, p. 32, et seqq., 4th edition.

2. According to Theodoret[p], Tatian, the disciple of Justin Martyr, omitted the genealogy in his harmony.

3. In some Latin MSS., that portion of the first chapter containing the genealogy is separated from what follows, having been apparently prefixed as a prologue to the work itself.

4. In Mark's Gospel, which follows that of Matthew very closely, and appears to have been abridged from it, there is no similar account of the birth and infancy of Jesus.

Such are the external arguments. But the internal are chiefly relied on. They are these:—

1. The commencement of the third chapter presents a serious difficulty, on the supposition that what precedes was written by Matthew: "*In those days* came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea," etc. The last event mentioned in the terminating portion of the second chapter is Joseph's going to reside at Nazareth; whereas the John the Baptist did not begin to preach till about thirty years afterwards.

2. The genealogy contained in the two chapters is irreconcilable with that given by Luke. The latter must have been regarded as correct by the apostles If Matthew were the author of the chapters, the genealogy given by him was also regarded as correct by the other apostles. Thus the apostles were acquainted with two genealogies, both correct, but apparently irreconcilable with each other. In recording either of the two, it is natural to suppose that a writer, knowing it might be confronted by another entitled to equal credit, would have inserted a few words of explanation. But Luke does not adopt this procedure. Hence it may be concluded, that no other genealogy was known to him, or to the apostles. Such is the argument of Norton.

3. There are striking discrepancies between the accounts of Jesus' nativity in the two chapters under examination, and in Luke's Gospel.

4. The story of the Magi is a strange mixture of astrology and miracle. "A divine interposition is pretended, which was addressed to the false opinions of certain Magi respecting the significance of the stars, and for which no purpose worthy of the Deity can be assigned. They are represented as having been

[p] Haeret, fab. i. 20.

guided by a star, which at last stood over the place where the child was, though an object but a little elevated in the heavens changes its apparent position in reference to objects seen on the earth, according to the point of view of the spectator. Distrusting, however, the guidance of the star, which had led them as far as Jerusalem, and which finally, as we are told, guided them right, they are represented as inquiring in that city where the object of their search was to be found; and in making this inquiry, we find them using language—*Where is the new-born King of the Jews?*—that must have been altogether unintelligible to those not equally favoured with themselves by a divine communication respecting His birth. These inquiries, according to the account, excited great alarm in Herod, who was fast approaching the grave, worn out with insane passions, disease, and old age; and whose want of faith in the Jewish religion, and natural temperament, would have led him to regard with derision the Jewish expectations of a Messiah. He could not have apprehended, that the remainder of his life would be disturbed by the future claims to his throne of an infant just born in obscurity; and his solicitude about what might happen, years after his death, to those of his children whom he had not destroyed, was little likely to disturb him. Yet he is represented as having been so carried away by fear and passion, as to act not only with the greatest barbarity, but the greatest folly—to have ordered an indiscriminate massacre, from which his intended victim actually escaped, when it is clear, that if the preceding circumstances related by Luke, or even the author of the two chapters be true, that victim might have been identified without any difficulty whatever[r]." The following replies may be given to these objections, in the order in which the latter have been stated.

1. In the passage of Epiphanius referred to, he is speaking of *the recension* or *edition* of the Gospel according to the Hebrews used by the Ebionites, not of that in the hands of the Jewish Christians generally. The same father testifies, that the Ebionites mutilated and corrupted the Hebrew Gospel which they had *not complete*, *οὐχ ὅλῳ δὲ πληρεστάτῳ, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ καὶ ἠκροτηριασμένῳ*. Those of the Hebrew Christians called Nazarenes, who

[r] Norton on the Gospels, notes, pp. 59, 60.

also used the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or rather *another recension* of it, had a fuller and complete copy, as Epiphanius states:—ἔχουσι δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον ἑβραϊστί. This probably contained the first two chapters, as may be inferred from Jerome's comments on Hab. iii. 3, and Isa. xi. The point would be a matter of certainty, if we could believe, with Olshausen, that the *in Hebraico* of this passage in Jerome, "Bethlehem Judaeae: librariorum hic error est. Putamus enim ab evangelistâ primum editum, sicut *in Hebraico* legimus Judae non Judaeae," meant the Hebrew copy of Matthew, and not the Old Testament text. But the latter is the true interpretation. The question then is, whether we should suppose the Ebionites to have taken away from their Gospel the first two chapters, or the Nazarenes to have added them. If Epiphanius is to be credited, the former cut off the genealogy. It is also certain, that they denied the miraculous conception of Jesus. Origen affirms that they rejected Paul's epistles, a circumstance favourable to the truth of Epiphanius' statement. When therefore we consider their denial of the miraculous conception, and their belief that Jesus was an ordinary man, the son of Joseph and Mary, it is natural to conclude that they rejected these chapters as militating against their creed. It cannot be pretended that all the Jewish Christians rejected the doctrine of the miraculous conception. The Nazarenes maintained it; whereas the Ebionites, as distinguished from the Nazarenes, held a view of Christ's person essentially *Gnostic*.

2. This argument proves too much; for we learn from the same source, that Tatian also omitted in his Harmony the genealogy contained in Luke's Gospel, and all passages tending to shew that Christ belonged to the posterity of David.

3. If this argument were valid, it would merely shew that the portion containing the genealogy is spurious, not the first two chapters. The Latin MSS. in which the division is made are few compared with the whole number, and they are of comparatively late origin. The reason of the separation may probably be ascribed to the copyists, who found it difficult to reconcile the genealogy given by Matthew with that found in the Gospel. Perhaps also they may have intended to mark it as

introductory, and so to distinguish it from *the proper commencement* of the Gospel itself.

4. This objection is exceedingly feeble. It rests on the assumption that Mark had the Gospel of Matthew before him when he wrote, which many deny; and also that he could not have had sufficient reasons for omitting the genealogy. But the object which he had in view, and the persons for whom he wrote, did not require him to commence at the point where Matthew had begun. It was far more appropriate for him to pass by the early life of Jesus, as we shall endeavour to shew hereafter.

To the internal objections we reply as follows:—

1. The phrase *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις*, like the Hebrew formula בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם, is used with considerable latitude. It connects a fact or event with what precedes, without designating the precise time of the fact about to be stated. Following the example of the Hebrew historians, Matthew, himself a Hebrew, and not intending to specify *the exact time*, might connect by this formula events separated by the space of thirty years. There is an analogous case in the Book of Exodus, where, after mentioning the childhood of Moses and his adoption by Pharaoh's daughter, it is immediately added, "And it came to pass *in those days*, when Moses was grown," etc. Here an interval of thirty years is omitted in the same manner. The words, *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις*, should therefore be rendered, *at that time*, meaning the period of Christ's incarnation generally.

2. This argument derives all its force from the assumption, that the two genealogies given by Matthew and Luke are irreconcilable. We admit that there are perplexing difficulties connected with them, which cannot perhaps be satisfactorily solved at the present day; but an absolute and direct contradiction between them cannot be allowed. The assertion has been frequently made, *but never proved.* The two genealogies are different, arranged on different principles, and written for different purposes; but they are not on that account contradictory and irreconcilable. The fact that Luke, supposing him to have written after Matthew, did not add some explanatory statement which might serve to render the contrariety less apparent, so far from militating against the apostolic origin of the first Gospel,

is rather confirmatory of it, as shewing that no difficulties were felt at that time. No contradiction was then thought of. The Jews brought no objection against Jesus' descent from David while he was on earth; and yet it is the object of the genealogies to shew that he *did* spring from that illustrious king, as had been foretold in the Old Testament. In the hearing of his adversaries he was frequently called the son of David, and they never disputed the fact. Neither was any objection made to the apostles when they referred his origin to the same personage. Our ignorance of the genealogical principles and rules of the Hebrews, and the remoteness of the period in which we live create perplexity, when there was none to Christ's contemporaries, or to his apostles[s].

3. We are unable to discover *contradictions* in the accounts of the first and third Gospels. Circumstances related by the one are omitted by the other, and *vice versâ*. This is the utmost extent of the discrepancies between them. Still, however, it is confidently asserted by many, that there *are* such irreconcilable points of opposition. Schleiermacher, Scheckenburger, Strauss, Bruno Bauer, De Wette, Norton, and others, urge them with confidence, chiefly with a view of impugning the credibility of the author of the first Gospel.

(*a*) The first contradiction, it is affirmed, consists in the accounts of Joseph's place of abode. "According to Matthew, Joseph dwells at first in Bethlehem. This, indeed, he does not state expressly, but in relating that Jesus was born at Bethlehem (ii. 1), and that Joseph, on his return from Egypt, had been divinely warned not to go to Judea, but into Galilee, and had therefore settled in Nazareth (ii. 22 f.), the historian obviously takes it for granted. According to Luke, on the contrary, Joseph, as well as Mary (i. 26), dwells in Nazareth, comes to Bethlehem only incidentally, and returns to his place of residence. Here every attempt to reconcile the accounts is impossible." These are the words of De Wette[t], coinciding very nearly with those of Schleiermacher.

[s] See my Sacred Hermeneutics, pp. 589-605. Wieseler's Article in the Studien und Kritiken, 1845, p. 361, et seqq.

[t] Exegetisches Handbuch, Lucas, p. 29, third edition.

It will be observed, that Matthew, who was less attentive to chronology and geographical circumstances, omits whatever was not conducive to his leading purpose in writing the Gospel. The parents of Jesus taking him from Bethlehem to the temple, and performing the rites prescribed by the law of Moses, returned from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, where the Magi visited the newly-born child; thence they fled into Egypt, and after their return dwelt in Nazareth. In the account of Joseph's return from Egypt, the writer of the two chapters supposes Bethlehem to have been his previous habitation, whereas Luke writes: "when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee to their own city, Nazareth." These words of the evangelist, in connection with his previous statements, exclude, it is said, the idea of Joseph returning to Bethlehem. He went to Bethlehem solely on account of the registry. Mary was subjected there to much inconvenience, and both must have been reluctant to undergo the fatigues of a double journey. Schleiermacher goes so far as to say, that "no ground for the supposition, either of employment in Bethlehem or of an intention to settle there, is afforded by Luke's narrative, or even consistent with it; and all his vividness is destroyed if we imagine that Joseph's return to Bethlehem was merely omitted."

We are unable to perceive the propriety or force of these remarks. Too much stress is laid on the inconveniences to which Mary and Joseph were subjected at Bethlehem. It is not said or implied that they were obliged to suffer them during the entire time of their stay, but only before and at the birth of Jesus. Luke's narrative does not presuppose that they could find no accommodation in the inn until they set out for Jerusalem, forty days after the child had been born. If it were possible to extract fairly from the account, that their situation was so uncomfortable for forty days, Schleiermacher's statement might be probable; but as there is nothing to indicate *that*, there is room for supposing that Joseph's temporary visit to Bethlehem may have led him to select it as his future abode in preference to Nazareth, especially as the circumstances of Mary's situation must have caused him to remain in the place for a time. He was bound to Nazareth by no special tie. He was poor, and would readily take up his abode

where he found the best means of employment. During his visit to Bethlehem, it is highly probable he resolved to make it the place of his permanent abode. That he obtained employment during the time of his second residence there, may be inferred from his being found in an *οἰκία* (Matt. ii. 11). When he first went to Bethlehem to be taxed, he lodged in an inn, or rather in the stable connected with it; but when visited by the Magi, he was in an *οἰκία*, not a *κατάλυμα*. On the contrary, it is never hinted that he had been the possessor of a house at Nazareth. Indeed, all the circumstances of the case, as related by the writer of the first Gospel, unite in rendering it probable that Joseph, according to his own purpose, had permanently settled in Bethlehem, although he may have gone to it originally with no other intention than that of returning to Nazareth. Hence he *would* have returned thither, after leaving Egypt, had he not been divinely warned of danger. The reason why Matthew passes over the previous abode at Nazareth obviously is, because mention of it would have contributed nothing to his object in writing for the Jews; whereas the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem was a fact of importance to him, because it had been predicted in the Old Testament that Messiah should be born there. Luke begins at a point of time prior to that with which Matthew commences. It lay directly in the way of his leading design to specify the abode of the child's parents; but he omits the sojourn of Joseph and Mary in Bethlehem, the visit of the Magi, the flight into Egypt, the sanguinary proceedings of Herod, and the return from Egypt. Hence he might the more readily conclude his general and rapid survey of the infancy of Christ, by characterising the settlement of Joseph at Nazareth as *a return* to the place; especially as his description appears to have been composed without respect to that of Matthew, and without the appearance of solicitude in regard to discrepancy. The abode at Bethlehem became *eventually* brief, having been interrupted by the flight into Egypt; and therefore the words in question might properly be employed as a concluding formula to the narrative of Luke. Those who press the words of the historian, understand *immediate succession*, as though the return to Nazareth followed the presentation of the child in the temple *immediately*. But the words should be understood *generally*. They need not be

insisted on as rigidly accurate. As well might it be inferred from Acts ix. 26, 27, that Saul went *immediately* from Damascus to Jerusalem; whereas it is known from the Epistle to the Galatians, that he went first into Arabia, and abode there three years.

(*b*) We are not insensible to the difficulty connected with the appearance of the star. Believing, however, as we do, in the supernatural and miraculous, the precise explanation must be left to those who take the ground of the natural. The whole matter appears to contain something extraordinary. It lies in part beyond the common course of events. Many perplexing questions may be raised concerning it which we are utterly unable to solve. What was the nature of the ἀστήρ? Was it an angel, as some of the fathers imagined; or a meteor, or a constellation, or a comet? How did the Magi know that it had reference to the Messiah? Was it by astrology, or by its appearance in the quarter of the heavens above Judea, or by a divine intimation?

The difficulties are magnified by Norton. He assumes that the word ἀστήρ denotes a fixed star; that the magi in the exercise of astrological science, ascertained the connection of the star with the birth of the Messiah; that they distrusted the guidance of it, which led them as far as Jerusalem; and that they used language unintelligible to persons not favoured like themselves with a divine communication.

That the account of the star is explicable by a real conjunction of Jupiter, Saturn, and Mars, is an idea which has lately found favour in the eyes of several scholars. Ideler[u] refers it directly to such a conjunction, ἀστὴρ thus denoting a constellation or group of stars. Keppler supposed[x] that the star which the Magi saw may have been an unusual one, which appeared at the conjunction of the three superior planets, Jupiter, Saturn, and Mars. This he inferred from having seen, in 1604, after Mars had approached Jupiter and Saturn, a new fixed star in the vicinity of the two latter planets, in the eastern foot of Serpentarius; and which, though shining brightly, very gradually faded, till it disappeared entirely in March, 1606. In identifying *the new star* which *may*

[u] Handbuch der Chronologie, vol. ii. p. 399, et seqq.
[x] De nova stella in pede Serpentarii, 1606, 4to.

have appeared at the conjunction, with the star of the Magi, Keppler is followed by Ebrard.

Wieseler adduces the case of a comet observed by the Chinese, immediately before the birth of Christ, as probably the same with the star in question; the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn which took place in 747 and 748 U.C., having excited expectations among the Eastern astrologers of some great event about to happen.

But notwithstanding all that has been said in favour of the synonymous use of *ἀστὴρ* and *ἄστρον*, we are inclined to think that the sacred writer would have hesitated to apply the former term to a constellation or conjunction of planets, instead of *ἄστρον*, the proper appellation. Besides, the ninth verse is opposed to these hypotheses. The phrase *προῆγεν αὐτοὺς, ἕως ἐλθὼν ἔστη ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον* may be thought, indeed, exactly to suit these astronomical calculations; as Münter[y], Paulus, Neander, Ebrard, and Wieseler believe. We fear, however, that the computations in question do not furnish a satisfactory explanation of the *ἀστήρ*. The air of the entire narrative does not perfectly accord with an ordinary fixed star, or a comet as adjunct of a conjunction of planets, nor with a mere conjunction itself. And after all that Wieseler has written, his arguments *a silentio*, his conceptions of the applicability of *προάγειν* to the motion of the star and of *στῆναι ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον*, the true exegesis of the passage seems to demand the introduction of ulterior elements or considerations. It would be very desirable to bring the phenomenon within the limits of astronomy and chronology, resolving it so as not to have recourse to the miraculous; but we doubt whether that result be attainable.

We are disposed to think that the *ἀστὴρ* was a meteor, or luminous appearance, not a fixed star, or even a comet. The word has this meaning in the Iliad, iv. 75. If this be correct, it was created for a certain purpose,—important indeed, but transitory. How far the astrological science of the Magi was brought to bear on such a phenomenon, it is impossible to discover. It is not easy to determine, whether the quarter of the heavens in which it appeared, or the sign of the zodiac *pisces*, led them to connect it with the Messiah. We know that an expectation of the advent

[y] Der Stern der Weisen, 1827, 8vo.

of a mighty temporal prince prevailed about this time,—an expectation which had spread from Judea into the East. Thus Suetonius, in his Vespasian (c. iv.), writes: "Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis ut eo tempore Judaea profecti rerum potirentur." So also Tacitus (Hist. v. 13): "Pluribus persuasio inerat antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judaea rerum potirentur." In this general expectation the Magi shared. When the extraordinary star appeared, their attention would immediately be drawn to it, especially if they were addicted to astrology. And in referring it to the Messiah with so much certainty, we may well suppose them to have been influenced by a higher agency than their own. Other circumstances combined to induce them to associate the phenomenon with the Messiah; but those circumstances would probably have been insufficient, without supernatural influence, to create a settled conviction of the connection, whence these wise men were led to undertake a lengthened journey to Judea. This is in accordance with the fact, that they were afterwards divinely warned (*χρηματισθέντες κατ' ὄναρ*) to return to their own country by another way. There can be little doubt that they were heathens, not Jews; for this is implied in their question, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" In them, therefore, as the representatives of the heathen world, we behold that world doing homage to its Lord. And if such were the significance of the transaction, surely it was not unworthy of Deity to interfere in the extraordinary mode implied in the narrative, as respects the appearance of the star and the supernatural illumination of the magi. There is no reason for asserting that they distrusted the guidance of the star because they asked at Jerusalem,—"Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" They had travelled to Judea, and its capital Jerusalem, in consequence of the remarkable phenomenon; and now they wish to discover the place in Judea where the Messiah should be born. The narrative does not even sanction the idea of the star being a general guide to them, by retaining the appearance and probably the locality which it had when they first perceived it; to say nothing of its moving before them during their long journey. On their leaving Jerusalem, it became a specific index to the place which they were directed to visit, in conformity

with a prediction contained in the Old Testament Scriptures. Even after coming to Jerusalem, they did *not* mistrust the appearance; for they are reported to have said, "We have seen *His* star in the East," etc.

(*c*) The sanguinary measures taken by Herod, who was extremely jealous and suspicious, are perfectly accordant with the character given of him by Josephus. Determined to make sure of his victim, he ordered an indiscriminate massacre. The victim indeed might have been identified without this general cruelty; but Herod was not the man to be at all scrupulous about injuring the innocent. Besides, we learn from Josephus that he was anxious about the succession to his kingdom, and could not bear the idea of its being alienated from his family.

(*d*) Another contradiction has been found in this, that in Luke's Gospel an angel is said to have appeared before the conception, while in Matthew's a similar phenomenon took place after it. The former was made to Mary, the latter to Joseph. But surely the angel's visit to Mary was not concealed from Joseph her husband. She must have communicated the purport of the celestial message; and so his scruples, and the angel's second visit for the purpose of removing them, were rendered unnecessary.

Such is the nature of the argument which the translator of Schleiermacher's essay on Luke puts very strongly with reference to Hug's reply. "Hug thinks, that notwithstanding Mary communicated the annunciation to Joseph, still he might naturally entertain doubts, which could only be removed in an extraordinary way. This remark would perhaps be just, if it were supposed that the communication was made only after Mary had returned from her visit to Elizabeth. But if, as would in the case of the Annunciation be most natural, Mary immediately related to Joseph the prediction made to her, coupled with the disclosure of Elizabeth's pregnancy (a fact which is represented as unknown both to her and Joseph at the time), in this case it would also have been more natural that he should wait for the issue of the prophecy; and though he might still entertain doubts, he would have had no inducement to the determination mentioned by St. Matthew i. 19. On the other hand, such a determination would most probably occur to him, if, as is clearly intimated by St. Matthew's

account, he only discovered the pregnancy of Mary when it was considerably advanced. But this supposition is quite incompatible with the Annunciation[z]."

We should be cautious in arguing from modern ideas of propriety and feelings of delicacy to those which characterised the inhabitants of Judea when our Saviour appeared on earth. Persons placed in unusual circumstances, and favoured with extraordinary manifestations, can scarcely be judged by an ordinary standard. The whole force of the observations just cited depends on the naturalness of the assumption that Mary would inform Joseph of the circumstance revealed to her by the angel. But at the time of the Annunciation she was living by herself, being only espoused to Joseph as his wife; and even after returning from her visit to Elizabeth, she was in her own home apart. It will be perceived from the narrative, that she set out for the house of her cousin very soon after the Annunciation. Having abode with her, her pregnancy was visible to Joseph on the return to Nazareth. The Virgin was of a thoughtful disposition. She loved retirement. She was given to meditation on the wonderful circumstances connected with her person. Why she should inform Joseph of the angel's visit and prediction to her, does not appear from the history, whatever *our* ideas of the propriety of the matter may be. When the nature of the Annunciation is considered, she might have no solicitude about Joseph's suspicions, being wholly absorbed in the marvellous object of the angel's visit, and having ample pledge in it of her future husband's satisfaction, even though a direct communication were deemed desirable or necessary to remove his scruples.

Other difficulties have been urged in the two chapters, to which it is not now necessary to advert. Several quotations occur in them, which it is not easy to reconcile with the originals in the Old Testament, and to which it is said the writer has affixed a sense different from that intended by the prophets.

The following positive arguments in favour of their authenticity may be stated:—

1. They are found in all *unmutilated* Greek MSS., and in all ancient versions. The only apparent exception in the case of

[z] A Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke, pp. 315, 6.

MSS. was thought to be in the Codex Ebnerianus, till Gabler shewed that it contained the first chapter.

2. The earliest fathers had them in their copies, and received them as a part of the Gospel. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, Ignatius says: *Πῶς οὖν ἐφανερώθη τοῖς αἰῶσιν; ἀστὴρ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἔλαμψεν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς ἀστέρας, καὶ τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἀνεκλάλητον ἦν, καὶ ξενισμὸν παρεῖχεν ἡ καινότης αὐτοῦ*[a]. "How then was He [the Lord] manifested to the world? A star shone in heaven above all the stars, and its light was inexpressible, and its novelty struck terror into the mind," etc. Here the allusion is probable, though we admit that Ignatius may have received the circumstance from tradition. Hegesippus, in a fragment of his history preserved by Eusebius, has the following: *Ἔτι δὲ περιῆσαν οἱ ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ κυρίου υἱωνοὶ Ἰούδα, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, οὓς ἐδηλατόρευσαν, ὡς ἐκ γένους ὄντας Δαβίδ· τούτους δὲ ὁ Ἰουόκατος ἤγαγε πρὸς Δομετιανὸν Καίσαρα· ἐφοβεῖτο γὰρ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς καὶ Ἡρώδης*[b]. "There were yet living of the family of our Lord the grand-children of Judas, called the brother of our Lord according to the flesh. These were reported as being of the family of David, and were brought to Domitian by Ivocatus. For this emperor was as much alarmed at the appearance of Christ as Herod." It is apparent then, that Hegesippus received the second chapter of Matthew's Gospel. Justin Martyr in his dialogue with Trypho writes: *Καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης μὴ ἐπανελθόντων πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀραβίας μάγων, ὡς ἠξίωσεν αὐτοὺς ποιῆσαι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα αὐτοῖς δι' ἄλλης ὁδοῦ εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν ἀπαλλαγέντων, καὶ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ἅμα τῇ Μαρίᾳ καὶ τῷ παιδίῳ, ὡς καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀπεκεκάλυπτο, ἤδη ἐξελθόντων εἰς Αἴγυπτον, οὐ γινώσκων τὸν παῖδα, ὃν ἐλελύθεισαν προσκυνῆσαι οἱ μάγοι, πάντας ἁπλῶς τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς Βηθλεὲμ ἐκέλευσεν ἀναιρεθῆναι· καὶ τοῦτο ἐπεπροφήτευτο μέλλειν γίνεσθαι τοῦ Ἱερεμίου, εἰπόντος δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος οὕτως· φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾷ ἠκούσθη, κ. τ. λ.* "But Herod, when the Arabian wise men did not return to him, as he had desired them, but returned by another way into their own country, according to a command given them; and when Joseph, together with Mary and the young child, were gone into Egypt, according to directions given them also by a

[a] Ad Ephes. c. 19.

[b] Euseb. H. E. iii. 20.

divine revelation, not knowing the child whom the wise men had come to worship, commanded all the children in Bethlehem, without exception, to be killed. This was prophesied of by Jeremiah, the Spirit of God speaking by him thus: 'A voice was heard in Rama.'" Irenaeus writes: *Ματθαῖος δε τὴν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ γέννησιν κηρύττει, λέγων· Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, κ. τ. λ*[c]. "Matthew relates that generation of Him [Jesus Christ] which is according to man, saying: *The book of the generation of Jesus Christ*," etc. Clement of Alexandria states: *Ἐν δὲ τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ἡ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ γενεαλογία, μέχρι Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ κυρίου περαιοῦται*[d]. "In the Gospel according to Matthew, the genealogy from Abraham is brought down to Mary, the mother of the Lord." Other testimonies might be added; but these will be reckoned sufficient.

3. The early heretics and opponents of Christianity were acquainted with this portion of the first Gospel. Thus we are informed by Epiphanius, that Cerinthus and his followers preferred this Gospel to the others because of the genealogy:—*Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Κήρινθος καὶ Καρποκρᾶς τῷ αὐτῷ χρώμενοι δῆθεν παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίου διὰ τῆς γενεαλογίας βούλονται παριστᾶν ἐκ σπέρματος Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μαρίας εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν*[e]. "Cerinthus and Carpocras, using the same Gospel, wish to shew from the beginning of the Gospel according to Matthew, by means of the genealogy, that Christ was of the seed of Joseph and Mary." *Χρῶνται τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίῳ . . . . . διὰ τὴν γενεαλογίαν τὴν ἔνσαρκον*[f]. "They [the Cerinthians] use the Gospel according to Matthew . . . . . on account of the genealogy relating to his flesh." Celsus, according to Origen, *παραθέμενον αὐτὸν πόλλα ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίου, ὥσπερ τὸν ἀνατείλαντα ἄστερα ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἄλλα τῶν παραδόξων, κ. τ. λ.* i. e. "he quoted many things out of the Gospel according to Matthew, as the star that appeared at the birth of Jesus, and other wonderful things." He thought that "the composers of the genealogies were extravagant in making Him to spring from the first man, and the Jewish kings." Here both Luke and Matthew are

[c] Contra Haer. iii. 11, sec. 8. [d] Stromata, lib. 1. [e] Haeres. xxx. [f] Haeres xxviii.

referred to. Various other passages, containing allusions to facts recorded in the first and second chapters of the first Gospel, are given by Origen from Celsus. Porphyry, in some books which he wrote against the Christians, among other charges accuses Matthew of falsehood for omitting a generation in the second fourteen (chap. i. 11)[g].

4. The commencement of the third chapter is closely connected with something preceding. Thus the phrase, *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις*, presupposes an antecedent context. The particle δὲ, in particular, sufficiently proves this assertion, for no Gospel could begin with *ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις, κ. τ. λ.* It is true that the δὲ is omitted by many good and ancient MSS., and not rendered in several versions. But the authorities in favour of its genuineness far outweigh the opposite, so that no critical editor has ventured to expunge it from the text. Griesbach conjectures that it was frequently omitted by transcribers, because a new *ἀνάγνωσμα*, or *reading-lesson*, began with the third chapter. But Bertholdt supposes that the copyists often felt the harshness inherent in the particle, as far as it was thought to connect two occurrences twenty-eight years distant in time. Hence they were disposed to omit it.

Again, the words occurring in the third chapter, thirteenth verse, "Then cometh Jesus *from Galilee*," etc. refer to some preceding mention of Galilee, such as that in chap. ii. 22. It is scarcely possible that any writer would have introduced the mention of Galilee so abruptly. The mode of expression presupposes that the reader had been advertised of Jesus' connection with the district. In like manner the commencement of the third chapter is connected with ii. 23; and iv. 13 with the same passage.

5. The diction of these two chapters bears the same impress and character which belong to the remainder of the Gospel, proving that the Gospel, as we now have it, proceeded from *one* author. The unity of language and style in this portion, compared with the other chapters of the same Gospel, has been already shewn. The same peculiarities of diction pervade the entire Gospel.

The last argument proves no more, than that the person who

[g] Hieronym. Comment. in Daniel, i. 1.

wrote the present Greek Gospel, composed the first two chapters equally with the others. And perhaps most, if not all the other arguments shew nothing more than that the chapters must always have formed a part of the Greek document. Hence some authors, as Norton and Kuhn[h], oppose the authenticity as regards the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, while they allow it as respects the present Greek Gospel. But the time in which Matthew wrote seems adverse to this supposition, as Meyer has pertinently remarked. It seems almost impossible, that the *mythic elements*, as they are judged by many; composing this early history, could have been incorporated with the evangelical history before the apostle wrote, if they had not been a genuine part of that history. We have already endeavoured to prove, that the Greek Gospel has all the claims on our reverent attention which the Hebrew document could have ever presented, so that it is sufficient for our purpose to shew that the Greek had always the two chapters in question.

VII. Time and Place at which the Gospel was written.

It has always been the prevailing opinion that the Gospel by Matthew was written first of all the gospels. To this sentiment, which was entertained in early times, we probably owe the position it occupies in the list of canonical books. It stands first in MSS. and versions. Various notices in Eusebius lead to the conclusion, that it was early believed to have been composed prior to the documents of Mark and Luke. Speaking of Clement of Alexandria, the historian says:—*Προγεγράφθαι ἔλεγεν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας*[i]. "He said that those Gospels which contain the genealogies were written first." Of Origen he gives these words, contained in the first book of his commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew:—*Πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τὸν . . . . . Ματθαῖον . . . . . δεύτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον, κ. τ. λ*[k]. "The first (Gospel) is written according to Matthew—the second is according to Mark." Eusebius' own sentiments harmonise with those of Clement and Origen as here stated.

It is exceedingly difficult to determine *the time* when the Gospel was written. We may notice four leading opinions respecting it:—

[h] Leben Jesu, vol. i. p. 142, et seqq. [i] H. E. vi. 14. [k] Ibid. 25.

1. Tillemont[l] thinks that it was written in the third year after Christ's ascension.

2. Theophylact[m] and Euthymius[n] refer it to A. D. 41. The former says: μετὰ ὀκτὼ ἔτη τῆς ἀναληψέως, "eight years after the ascension."

3. Nicephorus[o] and the Paschal Chronicle[p] date it fifteen years after the ascension, A. D. 48.

4. Irenaeus[q] places it *after* A. D. 60, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, "when Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the church in Rome."

Some who adopt the opinion of a Hebrew original endeavour to reconcile in part the different accounts by assuming an interval of about twenty years between the Hebrew original and Greek translation, and thus harmonising the extremes. The earliest dates concern the original composition; the latest refer to the Greek version. This is an ingenious expedient; but it may be questioned whether the writers who assign the preceding dates, especially the ancient ones, thought of *the version*. Certainly Irenaeus did not apply the date which he gives to the Greek version, because in the passage itself he speaks of it being written in Hebrew. The other authors spoke of the Gospel *as first written*, because they knew nothing of the person who made the version.

1. Tillemont arrives at this conclusion in the following manner: When Paul was at Jerusalem, the fourth year after Christ's ascension, he saw none of the apostles except Peter and James, a fact implying that the others, including Matthew, had left the city. But Matthew is said to have written his Gospel at Jerusalem, and therefore he must have composed it before Paul's arrival. This reasoning is inconclusive. It does not follow from the fact of Paul seeing none but the two apostles at Jerusalem, that all the others had left the city. Rather do we learn from Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, that they were at Jerusalem till the persecution which arose about Stephen was past (Acts viii. 1).

[l] Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclésiastique. Tome i.
[m] Prooem. in Matth. [n] Prooem. in Matth. [o] Hist. Eccles. ii. 45.
[p] P. 233. C. [q] Advers. Haeres. iii. 1.

Besides, it is a mere assumption, and one highly improbable, that Paul's journey to Jerusalem (Gal. i. 18.) was in the fourth year after the ascension.

The date assigned by Townson nearly coincides with that of Tillemont, viz. A.D. 37; while Owen[r] and Tomline[s] fix upon 38.

In favour of this early date these writers allege *a priori* and internal considerations such as:—

(*a*) The apostles preached the Gospel to the Jews immediately after the Pentecostal effusion. Hence it is likely that an authentic account of Christ's doctrines and miracles should be committed to writing, to enable the Jews to compare the history of Jesus with the ancient prophecies. So Tomline reasons. Other considerations are drawn from the Gospel itself, such as:—

(*b*) The state of persecution in which the church was when the Gospel was written. Now the greatest persecution raised against the church, while it was composed only of Jewish and Samaritan converts, was that begun by the Sanhedrim, and continued by Saul; a calamity which lasted till A.D. 39 or 40. Hence the Gospel was written before 39 or 40 to minister consolation to the suffering by setting forth the example of their suffering master. So Owen reasons.

(*c*) The evangelist's comparative gentleness in recording John Baptist's reproof of Herod, and his silence with regard to the insults offered to our Lord on the morning of the crucifixion, also shew the early date of the Gospel. Herod was still alive; and the writer was afraid to stir up his jealousy against his believing subjects. Hence he must have written before 39, when Herod was deposed by Caligula.

(*d*) The author frequently mentions Pilate as *then governor* of Judaea. Josephus relates, that Pilate having been ordered by Vitellius to go to Rome to answer a complaint of the Samaritans, hastened thither; but the emperor died before his arrival. As Tiberius died A.D. 37, it is probable that the Gospel was then written; for Pilate was banished by Caligula, Tiberius' successor. Such is the argument of Townson.

With reference to these reasonings we remark, that no weight

[r] Observations on the four Gospels, p. 32.
[s] Elements of Christian Theology, vol. i.

should be attached to *a priori* considerations in a question like the present. Here they may be employed with almost equal plausibility on both sides of the question. When it is affirmed that the Jewish Christians would hardly be left for a length of time without a written record, modern ideas of *what should have been* are urged, instead of the simple inquiry *what was the fact*. We are imperfect judges of the matter. The divine procedure is often contrary to what we should expect or deem probable. God's ways are not as man's ways.

(*a*) In opposition to the statement made by Tomline it might be said, that as long as Matthew and the other apostles preached the Gospel, especially in Judea, written accounts were less necessary. If *any* period is supposed to have elapsed between the ascension of Jesus and the composition of Matthew's Gospel, we may as well assume *seven* or *eight*, as three or four years, because the early converts *always* needed a written document. The circumstance, however, of their enjoying the presence and preaching of the apostles themselves, certainly rendered a record comparatively useless. "The life of Jesus," says Lardner, "could not be forgotten in thirty or forty years. His life and death were very public, as well as very extraordinary. His resurrection and ascension were most publicly attested by his apostles and others, as we know from the Book of Acts. And from that time forward there were many, who were continually speaking of the things said and done by him, and of the evidences of his resurrection and exaltation[t]."

(*b*) The state of persecution in which the church is said to have been, and the consolation furnished in the Gospel, are by no means obvious. As well may it be said that the Gospels of Mark and Luke, particularly the latter, indicate the same condition of the Jewish-Christian community in Palestine. They contain similar exhortations. They also prepare the early converts for severe trials, represent them as continually exposed to perils, and furnish consolations fitted to sustain them in the hour of suffering. The things insisted on are not peculiar to Matthew. They belong to the other synoptical evangelists. That they point to Caligula's persecution in particular, is neither

[t] Works, 4to. vol. iii. p. 164.

apparent nor probable. They are of a more general character. They are less specific. The first three Gospels are equally applicable to the position and circumstances of the Christians living in the first century before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. Those passages relating to active persecution *generally* bear a prospective character, and apply to the future desolation of Judea.

(*c*) This consideration is derived from a comparison of the portions referring to Herod with the corresponding parts of Luke's Gospel. But it proves too much. Mark writes about Herod in the same way as Matthew; and therefore by virtue of the same reasoning, his Gospel should be placed as early as Matthew's. Yet those who contend for the very early date of the first Gospel, by adducing this circumstance, do not fix the composition of the second earlier than A.D. 60. Hence there must have been some other reason for Matthew's omitting various particulars concerning Herod which Luke has given. There is certainly no appearance of gentleness towards that cruel tetrarch. Matthew relates John Baptist's execution, without omitting to mention that Herod would have put him to death before, had he not feared the multitude.

(*d*) Matthew mentions Pilate no less than nine times as governor of Judea. These instances occur in the seventeenth chapter. In the first example, the title *governor* is annexed to *Pilate's name.* In the others, *the title alone* is employed, chiefly to avoid frequent repetition of the proper name. Josephus sometimes applies the same epithet to Pilate; and the Jews must have understood it equally well as *Πιλάτος*. But it is not in the remotest degree implied that he was *ἡγεμών* when Matthew wrote his Gospel. He was *governor* when Jesus was delivered to him. This is the sum of a statement which cannot, without violence, be interpreted to mean, "Pontius Pilate *now* governor as he was *then*," or "*still* governor."

We have thus seen that neither *a priori* considerations nor internal testimony, preponderate in favour of a date so early as the third year after Christ's ascension; *i. e.*, A.D. 37 or 38.

2. According to Theophylact and Euthymius Zigabenus, this Gospel was written about eight years after the ascension; *i. e.*, about A.D. 41. The subscriptions to many Greek MSS. contain

the same date, which is also given in a life of Matthew written in Arabic, and published by Kirsten. It is not very probable that all such MSS. were posterior to the age of Theophylact, as Marsh supposes; or that the introduction into them of this date was owing to the authority of that writer alone. The opinion must have reached beyond Theophylact himself in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The date in question is much more ancient than Theophylact. Eusebius, in his chronicle, assigns the third year of Caligula, which nearly coincides with A.D. 41. In his ecclesiastical history indeed, he mentions no time, merely stating that Matthew, having first proclaimed the Gospel in Hebrew, committed it to writing when he was about to leave Judea. But, taking this statement in connection with the passage in the Chronicle, we may infer, that, in the opinion of Eusebius, Matthew left Judea soon after 41. It should be mentioned, however, that this statement of the Chronicle is wanting in many MSS., so that it is of questionable authenticity. The date in question nearly agrees with the opinion of Greswell, who assigns the composition of the first Gospel probably to 42, and Matthew's departure to 44. He thinks that Matthew wrote it nine or ten years after the ascension. It must be admitted, however, that it is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to discover when the apostles or Matthew left Judea to preach to other nations. Perhaps they did not go away at the same time, but at different times, as they were directed by divine agency.

3. Nicephorus Callisti and the Paschal Chronicle place the composition of Matthew's Gospel fifteen years after the ascension of Christ, without assigning any reason for that particular date.

4. Irenaeus appears to place it after 60; according to some, 61; though others say 64 or 65. But whatever value might belong to the testimony of this father in consideration of its high antiquity, is materially lessened by the character of the testimony itself. The term ἔξοδος is ambiguous, some rendering it *departure*, others *decease*. In opposition to the fact asserted by Irenaeus, it has been affirmed, that Peter never was at Rome. This is more than can be proved. But it is certain, that he did not *lay the foundation of* the Roman Church; and that he was not there before Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans. It is attested, however, by

ancient writers, that he was there before his death, where he suffered martyrdom with Paul under Nero. The term θεμελιοῦντων is incorrect, because the foundation of the church had been laid nine or ten years before. Peter and Paul could not together have *founded* a church so long planted. Bishop Marsh indeed thinks that the verb θεμελιόω, as used by Irenaeus, merely means to *build up* or *confirm*, not *to lay the first foundation.* But the plain, literal, obvious meaning is, to *lay the foundation of.* It is also more natural to render ἔξοδος *decease*, the word being so employed in the New Testament (Luke ix. 31). Marsh and others who rely on the evidence of Irenaeus as credible, understand ἔξοδος in the sense of *departure;* but even this is scarcely sufficient to vindicate the accuracy of that father, for Mark left Rome along with Peter, instead of remaining after him. In short, the testimony of Irenaeus cannot be received as valid, even though his words should refer to Paul's second imprisonment at Rome. Though he belonged to the second century, and had better means of knowing the truth than the fathers of succeeding centuries, yet his testimony must be judged by its inherent probability in connection with known circumstances. He may have readily made a mistake.

The circumstances adduced by Lardner in favour of a late date have been refuted by Townson. Conceiving that Matthew, and the other apostles called by our Lord to attend upon his ministry, required a considerable time for the removal of their Jewish prejudices and narrow notions regarding the extent of the Gospel commission, he thinks it necessary to assume thirty years after the ascension, during which correct ideas of the extent and spirituality of Christ's kingdom were acquired, as is manifest from the Gospel he wrote. But the day of Pentecost is a better period from which to date the illumination of Christ's immediate disciples. Their minds were expanded and their narrow prejudices scattered, by the descent of the Holy Ghost. If they were then fitted to preach the Gospel in its purity and universality, they were also qualified to commit the substance of it to writing. The arguments of Lardner generally, in favour of the year 64, are feeble. His fourteenth however is singled out by Marsh as important. "There is also an expression used by him [Matthew] once or twice, intimating that it was a considerable space since the time of the

event, and his writing about it: ch. xxvii. 8, *Wherefore that field was called the Field of Blood to this day.* Having related the affair of the soldiers, and the directions given to them by the Jewish council to say, *that His disciples came by night and stole him away;* he adds, *and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day* (verse 15). Such an expression does not denote any certain period: but one would think that, in this case, thereby must be intended a considerable space of time, more than eight, or ten, or fifteen years."[u] We have already stated, that these expressions probably proceeded from the Greek translator, not from Matthew himself. If so, they have no bearing on the time of the Gospel's composition.

Others bring down the origin of the first Gospel to a still more recent date. Thus, Hug supposes that it was written *shortly before* the destruction of Jerusalem. Credner, on the other hand, is of opinion, that the catastrophe of the city was *past* before *any* of the first three Gospels was written, founding his opinion on the very chapter in which it is commonly and correctly believed that the catastrophe is *predicted* (24th chapter). We are not, however, of those who deny the possibility or reality of prophecy. The passage (xxiii. 35), is also supposed by Hug, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, and Credner, to contain a decisive proof of the late composition of the Gospel. They identify the Zacharias there mentioned with Zecharias the son of Baruch, who, according to Josephus, was unjustly slain in the temple. To this there are various and insuperable objections. Granting that the participle ἐκχυνόμενον is apparently in favour of the hypothesis, the aorist ἐφονεύσατε contradicts it. Hug, indeed, *virtually* represents Matthew as committing an error, when he introduces Jesus using the past tense, ἐφονεύσατε, instead of the future, φονεύσατε, which he thinks the apostle might do the more readily, as he was writing subsequently to the event. It appears to us, however, highly improbable, that the sacred writer should put into the mouth of Jesus the futures, ἀποκτενεῖτε, σταυρώσετε, μαστιγώσετε, διώξετε, and then when the death of Zacharias is mentioned, change the tense into the past, as if Matthew could not refrain from concealing the fact, that the just man mentioned was already dead,

[u] Works, vol. iii. p. 164.

though Jesus is still the speaker. It is better to identify the Zacharias here spoken of with Zacharias, the son of Jehoiada the priest (2 Chron. xxiv. 19-24). All the objections made to this view are unimportant. When it is stated that Zacharias, the son of Jehoiada, was murdered *in the court of the house of the Lord*, whereas the Zacharias here mentioned was slain *between the altar and the temple*, there is no contradiction, for the altar was in *the interior court* or *court of the priests*, viz. the altar on which the burnt-offerings were presented. The phrase, *between the temple and the altar*, is erroneously explained by Hug, *ἐν μέσῳ τῷ ναῷ*. It is also true, that the Zacharias mentioned in the second book of Chronicles was not *the last* of the prophets slain by the Jews. But as *the canon is arranged* he is the last spoken of, though *chronologically*, the murder of Urijah (Jer. xxvi. 23), was later. Again, Matthew does not call him the son of Barachias by a lapse of memory, or confound him with another person of the same name; but the father may have had two names, a thing common among the Jews.

Eichhorn, Hug, and others also think, that the explanation of a circumstance which the writer thought would not be well known to his readers (xxvii. 15), proves that the Jewish polity had ceased. The remark, that it was customary for the Roman governor to liberate a prisoner at the Passover, was probably appended by the translator for the benefit of Jewish converts living out of Judea. It was intended to adapt the Gospel to a wider class of readers, by making it perfectly intelligible to more perhaps than those for whom it was at first specially designed by Matthew.

On the whole, we cannot allow that the Gospel was written at the commencement of the Jewish war, about A.D. 70; or after Jerusalem had been destroyed. The hints to which appeal has been made do not support the hypothesis.

A review of the discordant opinions in regard to the time of the Gospel's composition will shew, that all external evidence on the subject amounts to nothing, as long as it is so contradictory. Internal evidence is of the same character, being also unsatisfactory in contributing to the settlement of the exact period. It is indeed decisive that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem;

but *how long* antecedently, it is impossible to determine. All is conjecture on the subject. Were we to express an opinion, we should be inclined to adopt A.D. 41, 42, or 43, as the most probable. This accords with the date given by Eusebius; while all the circumstances, as far as they can be supposed to bear on the point, combine to shew that Matthew left Judea about 44. It was shortly before his departure that he wrote his Gospel to compensate for his absence. In regard to the time when *the version* appeared, we can only infer from the words of Papias, that it was in circulation before he wrote; that it was probably in circulation in the days of John the presbyter, and therefore of John the apostle. Hence it must have been made before the close of the first century; probably before the appearance of the Gospel of John.

The place where the Gospel was written is uniformly said to have been Judea. Whether it was written at Jerusalem cannot be *certainly* known, though it is generally believed to have originated there.

VIII. The Gospel of Matthew consists of six parts:—

1. The Birth and Infancy of Jesus (chapters i. ii).

2. Circumstances preparatory to his Public Ministry (iii. 1 — iv. 11).

3. His Public Appearances in Galilee (iv. 12 — xviii. 35).

4. His Journey to Jerusalem, and Residence there (xix. 1 — xxv. 46).

5. His Passion (xxvi. xxvii).

6. Resurrection (xxviii).

1. In the *first* part are related his genealogy, according to which he sprang from David and was at the same time *divine*, and the marvellous events connected with his childhood.

2. The *second* part narrates the appearance and preaching of John the Baptist; the baptism of Jesus by him; Jesus' inauguration by the Holy Spirit descending upon him, and a voice from Heaven proclaiming Him the well beloved Son of the Father; as also His temptation in the wilderness.

3. The *third* part may be subdivided into two portions, thus:— iv. 12—x. 42, and xi.—xviii. 35. The first of these contains the

Sermon on the Mount, a narrative of several miracles performed by Christ, and his sending forth of the Twelve Apostles. The chief object of the second half is to relate the effect of Jesus' discourses and actions on the public mind. Here the opposition he met with is a prominent feature in the description, so that the final catastrophe takes place, according to his own prediction.

4. The *fourth* part contains, first, the journey to Jerusalem (xix. 1—xx. 19); and secondly, his triumphal entry into the city; his refutation of opponents on several occasions; and the sublime prediction of his reappearance to judge Jerusalem and the world.

5. The particulars connected with his passion are minutely described in the *fifth* part, (xxvi, xxvii).

6. In the *sixth* part, we find an account of the resurrection, and how it was attested.

This brief analysis of contents may be useful to such as peruse the Gospel by itself; though no comprehensive or accurate acquaintance with the sacred document can be acquired without studying it along with the other Gospels.

THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

I. The Author.
II. The Persons for whom the evangelist wrote, and the chief object he had in writing.
III. Characteristics of the Gospel.
IV. Language in which it was written.
V. Authenticity.
VI. Relation of the Gospel to Peter.
VII. Time and Place.
VIII. Integrity.
IX. Analysis of Contents.

I. The author of the Gospel which occupies the second place in the order usually assigned the Gospels, has been uniformly styled *Mark*. Notwithstanding the doubts of some, and the positive disbelief of others, it is most probable that he is the same person who is sometimes called John (Acts xiii. 5, 13), and sometimes John Mark (Acts xii. 12, 25; xv. 37). It was customary for the Jews who associated with the Greeks and Romans, to assume Roman names. Hence arose the appellation *Mark*, which soon became commoner than the Hebrew *John*. He was a native of Jerusalem, and the son of Mary a decided friend of the Christians, in whose house they were wont to assemble. In the Epistle to the Colossians, iv, 10, he is styled *ἀνεψιὸς* of Barnabas, which may either mean *nephew* or *relative* generally. From this relationship it has been arbitrarily assumed, that he was of the tribe of Levi and the priestly line. On their first missionary journey, he accompanied Paul and Barnabas. But he left them at Perga in Pamphylia and returned to Jerusalem,—a step the reason of which is not given in the New Testament. It is probable, however, that his faith failed—that he was discouraged by the perils or fatigues of the work—or perhaps overcome by excessive attachment to his native country. While Paul was on his second missionary tour, he accompanied Barnabas to Cyprus. But although

Paul had been dissatisfied with his conduct, and refused to have him as a companion on his second journey, it would seem they were afterwards reconciled; for when the apostle was prisoner at Rome, he writes to Timothy to bring Mark with him, expressing his confidence in him. Hence we find him at Rome with Paul, and styled *the fellow-labourer* of the Apostle to the Gentiles (Coloss. iv. 10; Philem. 24). Thus the temporary breach between the brethren had been healed; the evangelist having penitently returned to his duty as an active labourer in the missionary field, and the ardent Paul receiving him again to his affectionate confidence. Of his remaining life nothing certain is known. The traditional accounts of it in early ecclesiastical writers cannot be relied on, and are not uniform. Origen considers him one of the seventy disciples of Jesus[a]; but this is denied by Papias or John the presbyter[b], and appears to be incorrect. Eusebius says[c], that he was with the apostle Peter in Rome. After Peter's death, he went to Egypt, founded several churches there, especially in Alexandria; and died in the eighth year of Nero's reign at Alexandria, according to Jerome[d]. Nicephorus[e] and Simeon Metaphrastes[f] represent him as having suffered martyrdom, a circumstance unknown to Jerome.

It was a conjecture of Townson's, that the young man introduced into the Gospel by the writer at the time of Christ's apprehension, was Mark himself (xiv. 51, 52). The conjecture seems a probable one. "On no principle," says Greswell, "except that of the personal connection of this anecdote with the history of the writer, can we conceive a reason sufficient to have caused its introduction into the body of a narrative with which it would otherwise have absolutely nothing to do. What use, may we ask, is made of this fact either before or after? How came it then to be associated with our Saviour's apprehension; and why was a circumstance apparently so trifling, and certainly so irrelevant, inserted in the midst of so grave an account? If the young man was the writer of the account, and an eye-witness of the transaction at the time; partly implicated himself in the danger of our Saviour; mistaken for a follower or disciple when not really

[a] Opp. i. 807.
[b] Ap. Euseb. iii. 39.
[c] H. E. ii. 15.
[d] Vir. Illustr. 8.
[e] H. E. ii. 43.
[f] Martyrium S. Marci.

such; afterwards converted to the faith; and finally St Mark the evangelist: I think he might naturally look upon this as the most interesting circumstance in his life; and its introduction into the rest of the account, under such circumstances, becomes any thing but foreign or irrelevant. If he does not mention his own name, this is an omission which may be defended on the principle of a Christian humility, and has an example in the similar silence of John[g]."

In the New Testament there is little indication of Mark's connection with Peter in his travels and labours. On the night in which the apostle was miraculously released from prison, he went to the house of Mark's mother, from which it may be inferred that the evangelist was well acquainted with Peter.

If the Mark mentioned by 1 Peter v. 13 be identical with the evangelist, we have a plain proof of intimacy between him and the apostle. In that case Mark was converted by Peter, and was with him in Babylon when the first epistle was written. Credner, however, followed by Neander and Tholuck, takes *υἱὸς* to mean a *true* son of Peter, and *συνεκλεκτὴ* to denote his *wife*. But it appears to us more natural to refer the epithet *συνεκλεκτὴ* to *the church* at Babylon. The expression *ἡ ἐν βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ* is not very appropriate to Peter's wife. Why should *ἐν βαβυλῶνι* be inserted? Had the words been *ἡ συνεκλεκτή μου*, they would have been suitable; but in the present instance they are awkward unless the reference be to *a church*. No example of a salutation proceeding from the writer's wife occurs in any of the epistles; while salutations are sent from churches, as we see in the epistles to the Romans (xvi. 16), and Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 19). Still it is said, that *τέκνον* is the usual expression for *spiritual son*, not *υἱὸς*. But although *Paul* employs *τέκνον* to denote *convert*, *Peter* need not be restricted to the same term. The style of these two apostles is dissimilar; why then must they adopt the same word in speaking of a spiritual child? It appears to us more probable that the Mark mentioned in 1 Peter v. 13 is identical with the evangelist. The objection made to this view by Neander does not seem of much force. "How can we suppose," says he, "that Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, who at all events must have come

[g] Dissertations, vol. i. pp. 99, 100.

when young to Jerusalem, and lived there in company with the apostles, could have first planned his evangelical narrative according to what he heard at a much later period, incidentally from the preaching of Peter[h]?" From the relations sustained by Mark, we may reasonably suppose that he was acquainted with the leading facts of the evangelical history before he became a follower of Peter. At what time he attached himself to Peter cannot now be ascertained. It must have been subsequently to Paul's second missionary journey. But although the New Testament furnishes little information respecting Mark's association with Peter, the voice of ancient tradition is not silent in regard to it. From a very early date we find distinct and unequivocal notices of companionship between the apostle and the evangelist, which could not have originated in 1 Peter v. 13, or have been derived from Acts xii. 12. On the contrary, they are independent of Scripture. Nor is there any good reason for doubting that Mark was the spiritual son of Peter, because the Acts of the Apostles are wholly silent on the point. It is true, as Neudecker affirms[i], that the writer of the Acts might have aptly introduced the fact that Mark was Peter's son in the faith; but when we consider how little of Peter there is in the Acts of the Apostles, and how much of Paul, we may be convinced that Luke acted conformably to his plan in furnishing such scanty notices of the apostle of the Jews.

The tradition affirming Mark's close connection with Peter is embodied in the following passages:—

Papias, or John the Presbyter, according to the relation of Papias, says: *Ὁ πρεσβύτερος (Ἰωάννης) ἔλεγε· Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα· οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δὲ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ' ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων· ὥστε οὐδὲν ἥμαρτε Μάρκος, οὕτως ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. Ἑνὸς γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν, ἢ ψεύσασθαί τι ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱστόρηται τῷ Παπίᾳ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου*[k].

[h] Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung, etc. vol. ii. p. 606, fourth edition.
[i] Lehrbuch der Einleitung, p. 225.
[k] Euseb. H. E. iii. 39.

"The presbyter (John) said: Mark being the interpreter of Peter, wrote exactly whatever he remembered; but he did not write in order the things which were spoken or done by Christ. For he was neither a hearer nor a follower of the Lord, but, as I said, afterwards followed Peter, who made his discourses to suit what was required, without the view of giving a connected digest of the discourses of our Lord. Mark therefore committed no mistake when he wrote down circumstances as he recollected them. For he was very careful of one thing, to omit nothing of what he heard, and to say nothing false in what he related. Thus Papias writes of Mark."

Irenaeus speaks in this manner: *Ματθαῖος ..... γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιοῦντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον, Μάρκος, ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε*[l].

"Matthew wrote a Gospel while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel at Rome, and founding a church there. And after their decease, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things that had been preached by Peter."

Clement of Alexandria, according to Eusebius, relates: *Αὖθις δ' ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς (ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι) ὁ Κλήμης βιβλίοις περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν εὐαγγελίων παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων τέθειται, τοῦτον ἔχουσαν τὸν τρόπον. Προγεγράφθαι ἔλεγεν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας. Τὸ δὲ κατὰ Μάρκον ταύτην ἐσχηκέναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν. Τοῦ Πέτρου δημοσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ κηρύξαντος τὸν λόγον, καὶ πνεύματι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εξειπόντος, τοὺς παρόντας πολλοὺς ὄντας παρακαλέσαι τὸν Μάρκον, ὡς ἂν ἀκολουθήσαντα αὐτῷ πόρρωθεν καὶ μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα, ποιήσαντα δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μεταδοῦναι τοῖς δεομένοις αὐτοῦ. Ὅπερ ἐπιγνόντα τὸν Πέτρον, προτρεπτικῶς μήτε κωλύσαι, μήτε προτρέψασθαι*[m].

"In the same books, Clement has given a tradition concerning the order of the Gospels which he had received from presbyters of old, and which is to this effect: he says that the Gospels containing the genealogies were written first; that the occasion of writing the Gospel according to Mark was this: Peter, having

[l] Adv. Haeres. iii. 1.

[m] H. E. vi. 14.

publicly preached the word at Rome, and having spoken the Gospel by the Spirit, many present exhorted Mark to write the things which had been spoken, since he had long accompanied Peter and remembered what he had said; and that when he had composed the Gospel, he delivered it to them who had asked it of him. Which, when Peter knew, he neither forbade nor encouraged it."

Tertullian writes to this effect: Licet et Marcus quod edidit evangelium, Petri affirmatur, cujus interpres Marcus[n], etc. "Although that Gospel likewise, which Mark published, may be said to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was," etc.

Origen, as given by Eusebius, writes: . . . . . *δεύτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ ποιήσαντα. Ὃν καὶ υἱὸν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ*[o], *κ. τ. λ.*

"The second Gospel is that according to Mark, who wrote it as Peter directed him; who also calls him his son," etc.

Eusebius speaks at length respecting the origin of Mark's Gospel: *Τοσοῦτο δὲ ἐπέλαμψεν ταῖς τῶν ἀκροατῶν τοῦ Πέτρου διανοίαις εὐσεβείας φέγγος, ὡς μὴ τῇ εἰσάπαξ ἱκανῶς ἔχειν ἀρκεῖσθαι ἀκοῇ, μὴ δὲ τῇ ἀγράφῳ τοῦ θείου κηρύγματος διδασκαλίᾳ, παρακλήσεσι δὲ παντοίαις Μάρκον, οὗ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλουθον ὄντα Πέτρου λιπαρῆσαι, ὡς ἂν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα, τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς καταλείψοι διδασκαλίας, μὴ πρότερόν τε ἀνεῖναι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ ταύτῃ αἰτίους γένεσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς. Γνόντα δὲ τὸ πραχθὲν φασὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον ἀποκαλύψαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἡσθῆναι τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν προθυμίᾳ, κυρῶσαί τε τὴν γραφὴν εἰς ἔντευξιν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, (Κλήμης ἐν ἕκτῳ τῶν ὑποτυπώσεων παρατέθειται τὴν ἱστορίαν, συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἱεραπολίτης ἐπίσκοπος ὀνόματι Παπίας) τοῦ δὲ Μάρκου μνημονεύειν τὸν Πέτρον ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ ἥν καὶ συντάξαι φασὶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης σημαίνειν τε τοῦτ' αὐτὸν τὴν πόλιν τροπικώτερον Βαβυλῶνα προσειπόντα διὰ τούτων*[p] (1 Peter v. 13).

"So great an illumination of piety had shone into the minds of Peter's hearers, that, not content with a single hearing, nor with unwritten instruction in the divine doctrine, they importuned with many entreaties Mark, the follower of Peter, whose Gospel we have, that he would leave them in writing a memorial of the

[n] Adv. Marcion. iv. 5. [o] H. E. vi. 25. [p] H. E. ii. 15.

doctrine he had delivered orally; nor did they desist till they had prevailed upon him: and thus they were the cause of the Gospel which is called according to Mark, being written. It is said, that when the apostle knew what had been done, the Spirit having revealed it to him, he was pleased with the eagerness of the men, and authorised that writing to be read in the churches. Clement has set forth the account in the sixth book of his Hypotyposes; and Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, agrees with him, and that Peter mentions Mark in his first epistle, which they say was composed at Rome itself," etc. etc.

The words of this chapter have been generally regarded as a quotation from Clement; but they rather contain Eusebius' own view, drawn in substance from Clement and Papias. In the former case, Clement is made to contradict himself: in the latter, Eusebius quoting from memory is mistaken in thinking that Clement and Papias attest his opinion.

The same historian, in his Evangelical Demonstration, has the following: "Ὅτε μὴν Πέτρος, οὐδὲ καθῆκεν ἐπὶ τὴν εὐαγγελίου γραφὴν, δι' εὐλαβείας ὑπερβολὴν· τούτου Μάρκος γνώριμος καὶ φοιτητὴς γεγονὼς ἀπομνημονεῦσαι λέγεται τὰς τοῦ Πέτρου περὶ τῶν πράξεων τοῦ Ἰησοῦ διαλέξεις. . . . . Πέτρος δὲ ταῦτα περὶ ἑαυτοῦ μαρτυρεῖ· πάντα γὰρ τὰ παρὰ Μάρκῳ τῶν Πέτρου διαλέξεων εἶναι λέγεται ἀπομνημονεύματα[q].

"As for Peter, out of excess of modesty, he did not think himself worthy to write a Gospel; but Mark, who was his friend and disciple, is said to have recorded Peter's relations of the acts of Jesus. . . . . And Peter testifies these things of himself, for all things in Mark are said to be memoirs of Peter's discourses."

To the same effect Jerome:—Marcus discipulus et interpres Petri, juxta quod Petrum referentem audierat, rogatus Romae a fratribus, breve scripsit evangelium, quod quum Petrus audisset, probavit, et ecclesiae legendum suâ auctoritate edidit; sicut Clemens in sexto hypotyposeon libro scribit. Et Papias Hierapolitanus episcopus, meminit hujus Marci; et Petrus in epistola prima, sub nomine Babylonis figuraliter Romam significans: Salutat vos ecclesia, quae in Babylone coelecta, et Marcus filius meus[r].

"Mark, disciple and interpreter of Peter, at the desire of the brethren at Rome, wrote a short Gospel, according to what he

[q] Lib. iii. c. 5.

[r] De vir. illustr. c. 8.

had heard related by Peter; which when Peter knew, he approved of it, and authorised it to be read in the churches, as Clement writes in the sixth book of his Institutions. Both Papias of Hierapolis, and Peter in his first epistle, mention this Mark; the latter figuratively calling Rome Babylon," etc (1 Pet. v. 13).

In another place, the same father writes:—Habebat ergo (Paulus) Titum interpretem; et B. Petrus Marcum, cujus evangelium, Petro narrante, et illo scribente, compositum est[s].

"Paul had Titus for his interpreter, and Peter, Mark, whose Gospel was composed in consequence of the apostle dictating, and the evangelist writing."

These testimonies unanimously assert a close connection between the apostle Peter and Mark. They apply to the latter the term ἑρμηνευτὴς or *interpres*. What then, it will be asked, is the import of the word?

The answer to this question is exceedingly difficult. In the opinion of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, and Kuinoel, the term chiefly relates to *language*, Peter being supposed unacquainted with Greek, and Mark explaining his teachings in that language. But the apostles appear to have been endowed with the gift of tongues, so that, for this reason alone, were there no other, ignorance of Greek can hardly be attributed to any of the apostles. Fritzsche[t] thinks, that the term *interpreter* applies to the evangelist, because he wrote down the sum of what Peter orally taught. Tholuck[u] conjectures that it is nearly equivalent to *secretary*, a person who develops and puts into style, either orally or in writing, the discourses of another. Perhaps it means the person who explains in another language the discourses of a second party, not by giving a bare version of them, but by unfolding and expanding them in a style adapted to their contents, so that they shall be readily apprehended, and produce a more vivid impression.

The character of the Gospel itself coincides with the testimony of antiquity, in inferring a connection between the writer and Peter. Thus we find an especial reference to the person of the latter, by the insertion of his name where no reason for it

[s] Epist. ad Hedib. c. 2.

[t] See note IV. at the end of the volume.

[u] In Kitto's Cyclopaedia.

can be discovered in the event related, and where no light is thrown by it on the event itself. His presence is marked in the Gospel, where the recording of it is apparently of no importance, and might have been omitted with equal propriety. Doubtless this peculiarity was owing to a desire, on the part of Mark, to bring out the apostle into prëeminence as his authority, while it evinces an intimate knowledge of circumstances respecting Peter, unnoticed by the other evangelists. Examples of this are furnished by chap. i. 36, where Simon is mentioned as being with Jesus, a circumstance omitted by Luke. In the account of the raising of Jairus' daughter, Peter, John, and James are mentioned as the only witnesses of the occurrence; whereas in Matthew's Gospel there is no allusion to them (Mark v. 37). In relating the story of the withered fig-tree, Peter is introduced as giving rise to a moral connected with the occurrence; but Matthew has no allusion to him (Mark xi. 20-26, compared with Matt. xxi. 20-22). Again, when Jesus on the Mount of Olives foretold the destruction of the temple, there is express mention of Peter, James, John, and Andrew, as being with him; whereas Matthew has simply *the disciples* (Mark xiii. 3). Peter's name is also expressly singled out in the message sent by the angels to the apostles on the morning of the resurrection (xvi. 7).

On the other hand, there are passages in the Gospel, from which it may seem at first sight, that Mark knew less of Peter's personal history than the other writers of Gospels. There are various omissions. Thus in Matt. xv. 15, Peter is introduced requesting the explanation of a certain parable, whereas Mark has *the disciples* generally. The fact of the apostle's walking on the sea is omitted; so also the remarkable blessing pronounced upon him, recorded by Matthew alone (xvi. 17-19). In like manner, the promise made to the apostles in answer to a question of Peter (Matt. xix. 28) is unnoticed. Although he was one of the two disciples sent to prepare for the Passover, his name is not given by Mark. The intenseness of his repentance, expressed by πικρῶς in Matthew and Luke, is also omitted. It is somewhat remarkable too, that the name Peter is not employed by Mark till the time our Lord bestowed it upon the apostle.

The ancients accounted for these omissions chiefly by means of

the modesty of Peter, who did not wish in his teachings to introduce circumstances that might seem to exalt or honour himself; and therefore Mark's Gospel, as a faithful abstract of his teacher's discourses, wants them. This explanation is probable enough. Reproofs are inserted; but promises and blessings having peculiar reference to the apostle are omitted. Thus the remarkable reproof administered to him by Jesus is given (Mark viii. 33); while the blessing pronounced upon him immediately before (Matt. xvi. 17-20) is omitted. Besides, there is a peculiar circumstantiality in his account of the denials of Christ, as foretold and subsequently fulfilled; and yet *the bitterness* of the repentance is passed by.

II. Persons for whom he wrote in the first instance.

It is obvious that this Gospel, though written by a Jew, or at least by one intimately familiar with Judea, was intended for Gentile believers, not for Jewish Christians. Hence localities in Palestine, as also Jewish usages and rites, are explained by the writer. Thus in i. 5:—

"And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem; and were all baptised of him in *the river of* Jordan, confessing their sins;" for which Matthew has: "And were baptised of him *in Jordan*, confessing their sins" (iii. 6).

Mark ii. 18.—"*And the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast;* and they come and say unto him, Why do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees fast?" etc. etc. Matthew wants the explanatory clause at the commencement: "Then came to him, the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft?" etc. etc. (ix. 14).

vii. 1-4.—"Then came together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the Scribes, which came from Jerusalem. And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled (*that is to say, with unwashen*) hands, they found fault. *For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders.*" Compare this with Matthew's words:—"Then came to Jesus Scribes and Pharisees which were of Jerusalem, saying, Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread?" (xv. 1, 2).

ix. 43, 48.—"And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than, having two hands, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched."

Here, and in the forty-eighth verse, a paraphrastical explanation of the Jewish word Gehenna is given; whereas in Matthew (viii. 8, 9), the simple word is employed.

xi. 13.—"And seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find any thing thereon: and when he came to it he found nothing but leaves; *for the time of figs was not yet.*" The last clause seems to have been added for the sake of persons who did not know that the figs in Judea were not ripe for gathering at the time of the Passover, when this event took place. Matthew, in the corresponding passage has:—"And when he saw a fig-tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon but leaves only, and said unto it," etc. etc. (xxi. 19).

xii. 18.—"Then come unto him the Sadducees, *which say there is no resurrection;* and they asked him, saying," etc.

xiii. 3.—"And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, *over against the temple,*" etc. etc. Matthew has no more than:—"As he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples," etc. (xxiv. 3).

xiv. 1, 12.—"After two days was the feast of the Passover, *and of unleavened bread:* and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put him to death. ..... And the first day of unleavened bread, *when they killed the Passover*, his disciples," etc. etc. On comparing these verses with the corresponding ones in Matthew (xxvi. 1, 17), it will be found, that the explanatory clauses marked in italics are wanting.

xv. 6, 16, 42.—"*Now at that feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired.* ..... And the soldiers led him away into *the hall called* Prætorium, etc. etc. ..... And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, *that is, the day before the Sabbath.*" (Compare Matt. xxvii. 15, 27, 57).

No passages are quoted in proof of the positions of the writer, or to shew the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, except when such passages are unavoidably introduced in recording the discourses of Jesus. In accordance with this fact, the term νόμος,

which commonly designated *the law of Moses* among the Jews, does not occur in Mark. In the same manner we account for the omission of Jesus' genealogy.

Again, things which might be supposed important to the Jews alone are omitted; while statements that might give offence to the Gentiles are likewise suppressed. We find accordingly, that such passages as Matt. xxiii, in which woes are denounced against the Scribes and Pharisees, and a lamentation pronounced over Jerusalem; the parable of the marriage of the King's Son, in Matt. xxii. 1-14; the references to the law and Old Testament in Matt. xii. 5-7; our Lord's reflections occasioned by the Scribes and Pharisees asking a sign, in Matt. xii. 38-45, are omitted.

In the sixth chapter of Matthew, 7th and 8th verses, are these words:—"But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him." For Mark to have repeated such words might have given needless offence to the Gentiles. So also in the charge given by our Lord to his disciples, as narrated by Matthew, we have these words inserted:—"*Go not into the way of the Gentiles*," etc. etc., to which there are no corresponding terms in Mark's Gospel (compare Matt. x. 5, 6, with Mark vi. 7-11).

From these observations it will be apparent, that the Gentiles were the class of readers for whom the Gospel was written. The entire plan and structure of it coincide with this conclusion. But not only was the document intended for Gentile converts, there are also appearances of its adaptation to the use of Roman Christians in particular. In proof of this, various expressions have been adduced, such as δηνάριον, λεγεών, σπεκουλάτωρ, κεντυρίων, κῆνσος, κοδράντης, κράββατος, φραγελλόω, πραιτώριον, οὐαί (vah)! παιδιόθεν (a puero), μεσονύκτιον as a division of time, ἀπέχει (sufficit), ἀλεκτοροφωνία (gallicinium), ἄμφοδον (ambivium), σύσσημον, ἅλας ἅναλον (sal insulsum), ἀπολαβέσθαι (seorsum recipere), ἐσχάτως ἔχειν (in extremis esse), μεγιστᾶνες (magnates), μεθόρια (confinia), τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι (satisfacere), ξέστης. These expressions however, some of which are not

Latinisms, do not indicate the locality of those for whom the Gospel was composed. Most of them are used by the other evangelists, even those which are manifestly Latin. If therefore the Gospel was designed for Roman converts in particular, that fact must be deduced from other considerations. That it *may have been* intended for such in the first instance is possible, and is even implied in several external testimonies regarding Mark's connection with the apostle Peter; but the use of the terms in question is no proof of that purpose.

The object of Mark in writing the Gospel does not seem to have been a specific one. Nothing in the document itself shews that he wished to accomplish by it any definite purpose, farther than the instruction of the converts to whom it was originally addressed. The principal facts and events of the Gospel history are narrated, especially the miracles of Jesus. These, taken in connection with the avoidance of notoriety on the part of the doer, would naturally strike the Gentile mind. All that can be predicated with truth of the evangelist's purpose in writing a Gospel, apart from such external motives as may have operated on his mind is, that he meant to enlighten Gentile converts in the leading facts of Jesus' life on earth, and so to strengthen their faith. For this end he appears in the character of an historian simply, not in that of a *doctrinal* historian. He deals with events, rather than discourses or parables.

III. Characteristics.

(*a*) Mode of Narration. (*b*) Diction.

(*a*) Mark's descriptions are lively, vivid, and graphic. They are adapted to impress the mind by their freshness of colouring. In this respect he presents a remarkable contrast to Matthew. Hence he shews a decided preference for the use of the present tense, as in i. 25, 40, 44; ii. 3, 4, 5; iii. 4, 5, 13, 20, 31, 34; iv. 37; v. 15, 22; vi. 7, 30, 48; vii. 32; viii. 1, 22; xi. 1, etc.; xii. 13, 18, 36, 43; xiii. 1; xiv. 12, 17, 43, 66, 67; xv. 16, 17, 21, 22, 24; xvi. 2, 4, etc.

The particle εὐθέως is frequently employed for the same purpose, especially in transitions, as in i. 10, 18, 20, 21, 29, 30, 42, 43; ii. 2, 8, 12; iii. 6; iv. 5, 15, 16, 17, 29; v. 2, 13, 29, 30, 36, 42;

vi. 25, 27, 45, 50, 54; vii. 35; viii. 10; ix. 15, 20, 24; x. 52; xi. 2, 3; xiv. 43, 45; xv. 1.

Persons themselves are introduced as directly speaking, where the third person is employed by the other synoptists, as iv. 39; v. 8, 9, 12; vi. 23, 31, 33; ix. 25, 33; xii. 6.

Perhaps the same reason will account for the use of so many Aramaean words, to which, however, as he wrote for Gentiles, he appends the explanation; iii. 17, 22; v. 41; vii. 11, 34; ix. 43; x. 46; xiv. 36; xv. 22, 34.

In conformity with his graphic ability he enters into details. His descriptions are not only vivid but minute. He introduces more particulars than the other evangelists, especially such as are adapted to arrest and fix the attention. Hence his descriptions partake of a precision which does not appear in Matthew and Luke.

This peculiarity may be observed, (1) in reference to persons, as in i. 20; iii. 5, 17, 32, 34; iv. 11; v. 32, 37, 40; vi. 40, 48; vii. 1, 25; viii. 10, 27; ix. 15, 36; x. 16, 23, 35, 46; xi. 21, 27; xiii. 1, 3; xiv. 18, 20, 37, 65; xv. 7, 21, 40, 47; xvi. 7.

(2) In reference to locality, as in i. 28; iv. 1, 38; v. 11, 20; vi. 55; vii. 31; viii. 10, 27; ix. 30; xii. 41; xv. 16, 39; xvi. 5.

(3) With regard to notices of time, as i. 32, 35; ii. 1, 26; iv. 26, 35; vi. 2; xi. 11, 19, 20; xiv. 1, 12, 17, 30, 68, 72; xv. 1, 25, 33, 34, 42; xvi. 1. 2.

(4) With regard to numbers, as in v. 13, 42; vi. 7; xiv. 30.

In relation to the consecution of his narratives, Mark puts them together very loosely. Isolated facts are generally linked together by the conjunction *καὶ*, or by *πάλιν*. Of the former, every chapter furnishes examples, as i. 21, 39, 40; ii. 1, 2, 3, 13, 18, 23; iii. 1, 7, 13, 20, 22, 23; iv. 1, 21, 24, 26, 30, 35, 36, 37; v. 1, 18, 20, 21; vi. 1, 7, 14, 30, 45, 46, 47; vii. 1, 24; viii. 11, 22, 27; ix. 1, 14; x. 13, 35, 46; xi. 27; xii. 18, 35, 38, 41; xiii. 1. 3, etc. etc. For the latter, we refer to ii. 1, 13; iii. 1, 20; iv. 1; v. 21; vii. 31; viii. 13, 25; x. 1, 10, 24, 32; xi. 27; xii. 4, 5; xiv. 39, 40, 61, 69, 70; xv. 4, 12, 13.

Mark is also characterised by a conciseness and apparent incompleteness of delineation which are allied to the obscure. This

feature, however, must not be exaggerated, as it has been by many, for the purpose of shewing that the Gospel has been made up out of Matthew and Luke, and cannot be fully understood without them. Examples of it are presented in i. 13; ix. 5, 6, compared with Matt. xvii. 6. Here the *ἦσαν γὰρ ἔκφοβοι*, corresponding to the *ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα* of Matthew, is not accounted for in the preceding context, as in that of the first Gospel. Again, iv. 10-34, when compared with the parallel representations of Matthew and Luke, shews considerable obscurity in the consecution of ideas, so that it is difficult to obtain a clear apprehension of the adaptation of every phrase and sentence in the places they occupy. See also the abrupt introduction of iii. 28, et seqq. Compare in like manner, under this head, xiv. 65; xii. 34; ix. 37, etc.

The following passages will serve to exemplify Mark's mode of narration: v. 22-43, compared with Matt. ix. 18-26; ix. 14-29, compared with Matt. xvii. 14-21; vi. 39-42, compared with Matt. xiv. 19, etc. Here it will be seen, that instead of grouping together similar facts or discourses like Matthew, he enters more into detail, drawing a graphic picture every part of which heightens the general effect.

(*b*) The peculiarities of diction have been arranged by Credner under distinct heads, which we shall generally follow.

1. The frequent use of Latin terms and expressions. These have been already adduced.

2. Unusual words, expressions, and constructions, as *ἐξάπινα*, ix. 8; *ἐπισυντρέχειν*, ix. 25; *νουνεχῶς*, xii. 34; *νάρδος πιστικὴ* xiv. 3; *ἐνειλέω*, xv. 46; *ἤφιε*, i. 34; xi. 16; *προσκαρτερεῖν*, spoken of a thing, iii. 9; *ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων*, iv. 38; *προέλαβε μυρίσαι*, xiv. 8.

3. *Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον*, i. 23, 26, 27; iii. 11, 30; v. 2, 8, 13; vi. 7; vii. 25; ix. 25. Luke uses the same phrase, but not so frequently. It occurs twice in Matthew's Gospel.

4. A frequent use of diminutives, as *θυγάτριον*, v. 23; vii. 25; *κοράσιον*, v. 41, 42; vi. 22, 28; *κυνάρια*, vii. 27, 28; *ὠτάριον*, xiv. 47 in some MSS.

5. Mark frequently repeats the substantive instead of putting a pronoun, as in i. 34; ii. 16, 18, 20, 22, 27, 28; iii. 1, 3, 17, 24,

25, 26; iv. 15; v. 9, 40, 41; vi. 17, 18, 41; vii. 29; viii. 35; x. 13, 46; xiii. 15; xiv. 4, 5, 66, 67; xv. 20.

For the sake of emphasis and clearness, he manifests a strong tendency to repeat the same thing in similar or kindred expressions. Hence:—

6. He accumulates negatives, as *οὐκέτι οὐδείς*, vii. 12; ix. 8; xii. 34; xv. 5; *μηδενὶ μηδέν*, i. 44; *οὐκέτι οὐ μή*, xiv. 25; *μηκέτι μηδείς*, xi. 14. Comp. iii. 27; v. 3, 37; vi. 5; ix. 41; x. 15; xii. 14; xiii. 2, 19, 31; xiv. 31, 60; xv. 4.

7. He subjoins a word or words to adverbs, for the purpose of specification, as *τότε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*, ii. 20; *διαπαντὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας*, v. 5; *εὐθέως μετὰ σπουδῆς*, vi. 25. See also vii. 21; viii. 4; x. 30; xiii. 29; xiv. 30, 43. Comp. i. 32.

8. He connects expressions similar in meaning, as *ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη*, i. 42; *χρείαν ἔσχε καὶ ἐπείνασε*, ii. 25; *ὁρᾶτε βλέπετε*, viii. 15; *μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε*, xiii. 11; *βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε*, xiii. 33; *οὐκ οἶδα οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι*, xiv. 68. Comp. iv. 6, 8, 39; v. 12, 23; xiv. 15, 18.

9. He repeats what has been already expressed in other words, either (*a*) by appending the opposite, as i. 22, 45; ii. 27; iii. 26, 27, 29; iv. 17, 33, 34; v. 26, 39; vii. 19; viii. 33; ix. 8, 37; x. 8, 14, 40, 45; xi. 23, 25, 26; xii. 14, 27, 32; xiii. 20; xiv. 61; xvi. 6.

Or (*b*) tautologically, as ii. 15, 19; iii. 7; iv. 32; vi. 55, etc.; viii. 17, 21; ix. 38; xii. 22, etc., 29, etc.; xiii. 9, 23; xiv. 15, 66.

10. A favourite word of Mark's is the verb *ἐπερωτᾶν*, v. 9; vii. 5, 17; viii. 5, 23, 27; ix. 11, 16, 21, 28, 32, 33; x. 2, 10, 17; xi. 29; xii. 18, 28, 34; xiii. 3; xiv. 60, 66; xv. 2, 4, 44. He has it twenty-five times. In Matthew it occurs eight times, and in Luke eighteen times.

11. *Συμβούλιον ποιεῖν*, iii. 6; xv. 1. Matthew has *συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν*.

12. The elliptic *ἵνα*, v. 23; xiv. 50.

13. *Ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* occur in considerable number, as *ἄλαλος*, vii. 37; ix. 17, 25; *ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι*, ix. 15; xiv. 33; xvi. 5, 6; *ἐναγκαλίζεσθαι*, ix. 36; x. 16; *κεντυρίων*, xv. 39, 44, 45; *προμεριμνᾶν*, xiii. 11; *προσπορεύεσθαι*, x. 35; *στίλβειν*, ix. 3;

στοιβάς, xi. 8; συνθλίβειν, v. 24, 31; σκώληξ, ix. 44, 46, 48; παιδιόθεν, ix. 21; σμυρνίζω, xv. 23.

On the whole, the diction of Mark approaches nearer that of Matthew than Luke; for while he has forty-five words in common with the former, he has only eighteen with the latter. It possesses a Hebraistic colouring, and is far from being pure, elegant, or accurate. Such constructions and modes of expression as ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γεννησαρέτ καὶ προσωρμίσθησαν, vi. 53; τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν. ᾗ παρεδώκατε, vii. 13; ἔσωθεν ἐκ τῆς καρδίας, vii. 21; ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἧς ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς . . . . . διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς, οὕς ἐξελέξατο, xiii. 19, 20; δύο δύο, vi. 7; συμπόσια συμπόσια, vi. 39; πρασιαὶ πρασιαί, vi. 40; ἧς εἶχε τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς, vii. 25; and εἷς καθ' εἷς, xiv. 19; παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν. . . . ἀλλ' ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια· καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι, κ. τ. λ. vi. 8, 9; ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος . . . . . καὶ οὐκέτι ἀφίετε, κ. τ. λ. vii. 11, 12; καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν, εὐθέως τὸ πνεῦμα ἐσπάραξεν αὐτόν, ix. 20; ἐὰν εἴπωμεν . . . . . ἐφοβοῦντο, xi. 32; ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν αὐτῷ, ζητοῦντες, κ. τ. λ. viii. 11; ὃς, ὅταν σπαρῇ . . . . . καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ, iv. 31, 32; καὶ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ . . . . . ἔρχονται xi. 27; οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς. Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς, κ. τ. λ., xv. 10, 11; καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ, κ. τ. λ., iii. 11, are an offence against the elementary principles of the Greek language, as well as against elegance. It is impossible to account for the evangelist's linguistic peculiarities. Gieseler[x] explains their resemblance to those of Matthew rather than Luke by the fact of Mark's dependence on Peter, who, as the apostle of the Jews, adhered to the Palestinian type of doctrine, not only in substance but in words, while preaching in foreign countries. This supposition is not natural. Mark's residence in Palestine will better account for the fact, as far as it can be resolved into the controlling influence of external circumstances.

IV. Original Language of the Gospel.

According to the almost unanimous belief of the early church, the Gospel was written at *Rome*. Hence the conclusion was

[x] Historisch-Kritischer Versuch über die Enstehung und frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien. 1818, 8vo.

drawn, that it must have been composed in *the language of the Romans;* that is, Latin. Even in the old Syriac version, a remark is annexed, stating that the writer preached the Gospel in Roman (Latin) at Rome; and the Philoxenian version has a marginal annotation to the same effect. The Syrian churches seem to have entertained this opinion generally, as may be inferred not only from these versions, but from some of their most distinguished ecclesiastical writers, such as Ebedjesu. Many Greek MSS., too, have a similar remark regarding the language of our Gospel, originally taken, perhaps, from the Syriac. Thus they exhibit the words ἐγράφη ῥωμαϊστὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ. Baronius[y], Contzen, Bellarmine, and other Catholics, eagerly seized on the circumstance for the purpose of magnifying the Latin vulgate. But they were refuted by one of their own church, the acute Simon[z]. It was afterwards given out to the world, that the Latin original was still preserved in the library of St. Mark's at Venice. But the story proved to be fabulous. The pretended autograph is part of an ancient Latin MS. of the four Gospels[a], which was published by Dobrowsky, at Prague[b].

Assuming that the Gospel was composed at Rome, it is illogical to suppose that it must be in Latin. In that case, the Epistle to the Romans should also have been in Latin. The Greek language was prevalent at Rome and throughout the Roman dominions, except Spain. The Latin tongue was not so generally used. Hence the Gospel was written in Greek, that it might be more widely circulated and understood. God provided for its utility by having it composed at first in Greek.

It is scarcely necessary to allude to the singular hypothesis of Wahl, that the Gospel appeared at first in the Ethiopic tongue. No other person has adopted the notion.

V. Authenticity.

Here much depends on the statement of John the presbyter, as preserved by Papias and recorded in Eusebius' history. According

[y] Annal. ad ann. Christ. 45.
[z] Kritische Schriften über das N. T. part i. p. 178, et seqq.
[a] The Codex Forojuliensis.
[b] Fragmentum Pragense Evangelii S. Marci, vulgo autographi, etc. Pragae, 1778, 8vo.

to Schleiermacher, Strauss, Credner, Schneckenburger, Weisse, and others, the presbyter's statement is not applicable to the present Gospel of Mark. Let us examine it minutely. But before proceeding to this task it should be recollected, that John the elder was not inspired, and consequently not infallible. His opinions ought not to be taken *implicitly* as true and correct. Particular circumstances may render his decisions doubtful in particular cases. His sentiments, in short, must be *tested*, like those of an ordinary man; allowance being made for the position he occupied and the advantages he possessed. We are at perfect liberty to depart from his opinions wherever there is valid reason for doing so. So also with regard to Papias. If therefore the language of the latter writer does not agree with the form in which the Gospel of Mark has come down to us, it is not necessary to infer that another document is meant. His judgment may be wrong in the matter. It is perfectly allowable to conclude, that John the presbyter or Papias was mistaken in thinking that Mark wrote *οὐ τάξει*, for the Gospel itself may be opposed to the supposition. It is illogical to infer, on THE ASSUMPTION *that either's opinion was correct*, that the present Gospel of Mark was not written by the evangelist.

Let us first proceed on the assumption, that the statement of John the presbyter is correct, and consider whether it be totally irreconcilable with *the present Gospel* of Mark.

The question turns, in a great degree, on the meaning of the word *τάξις* in the passage. Credner assumes, that it denotes *arrangement* generally—every kind of sequence or order, whether it be chronological or a concatenation of facts like that presented by Matthew's Gospel, where they are grouped together so as to form a *συντάξις*. All arrangement, he thinks, is excluded by the phrase *οὐ τάξει*, whereas in reality the evangelist before us has the same *συντάξις* with Matthew and Luke. If therefore the phrase be referred to Mark's present Gospel, the credit of the other synoptists is destroyed.

In reply to this reasoning, some would argue in the following manner:—It is readily granted that the meaning of *τάξις* is general, including arrangement in different ways, good or just order, chronological order, etc. etc. But *the exigency of the place* may limit

and define the signification, rendering it *specific*. Looking at the τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα, οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ of the context, it may be affirmed, that the import of τάξις in the passage is *chronological* order or succession. Had not the term been employed to specify *a peculiar kind* of arrangement, such as *the chronological*, it would have been trifling, if not absurd, to say οὐ τάξει, because some sort of sequence or order would arise almost necessarily in an attempt to record the chief discourses and actions of our Lord. Absolute disorder in such a narrative would be inconceivable. When Peter is said to have suited his teachings πρὸς τὰς χρείας, it need not be inferred that he observed no order or arrangement in presenting portions of the evangelical history. Credner takes the expression οὐ τάξει as implying that Mark composed his Gospel *in a manner similar* to Peter, who used the Gospel history as occasion or necessity demanded. But this is an untenable assumption. Doubtless Peter stated the facts and doctrines in different forms and arrangements, at various times, and therefore Mark could not write in a mode *exactly similar*. Οὐ τάξει, in connection with the subsequent explanation, may be introduced to justify the evangelist in deserting *chronological* arrangement. It may be an expression meant to exclude the idea of chronological order, while the subsequent context accounts for Mark's departure from such order. From the language here applied to Mark's Gospel, the presbyter perhaps looked upon Matthew's as *chronological*. The evangelist was neither a hearer nor a disciple of the Lord, and therefore he did not write τάξει; implying, that had he been an immediate hearer or disciple, he would have written ἐν τάξει. That this was an erroneous idea is now commonly admitted; for Matthew's Gospel, though frequently regular, departs in many instances from chronological succession.

Tholuck gives another interpretation, according to which the words of John the presbyter, or of Papias, are applicable to the Gospel. He finds the explanation of οὐ τάξει in the subsequent words ἕνια γράψας, "writing *isolated facts*." In his view, οὐ τάξει signifies no more than *incompleteness*. Mark wrote *some parts* of the evangelical history, but did not give all the particulars of it.

It is difficult to see the propriety or clearness of the Greek words, if employed to express this idea. It would have been much simpler to have said *οὐ μέντοι τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, κ. τ. λ.* The meaning assigned is not obvious, and is in other respects improbable. Ebrard furnishes an explanation similar to that of Tholuck. He thinks that *τάξις* denotes *a certain kind of order*, but not *chronological succession;* and thus *οὐ τάξις*, in his view, accords with the character of the Gospel, consisting, as he says, of *isolated facts* in the life of Christ, loosely linked together, rather than a closely connected digest of the principal materials. In the same way Reuss judges, when he describes the document as properly consisting of a series of anecdotes without connection, without chronology, and almost without discourses inserted. But it is difficult to see in what respects Mark's Gospel is more loose and disjointed than those of Matthew and Luke. The matter of it appears to be as well digested as that of the former at least. Nor can we see any probability in Meyer's assumption of a twofold *γράφειν* on the part of Mark, in the fragment; one that took place immediately after the evangelist had heard the discourses of Peter, the other denoting the subsequent writing of *the second Gospel.*

We are inclined to agree with those who consider the expression *οὐ τάξει* unsuitable to the present Gospel of Mark. As far as we are able to understand the entire fragment, it is most natural to consider John the presbyter or Papias assigning a sense to *οὐ τάξει* which does not agree with the character of the canonical document. It is *possible*, as we have seen, to reconcile the phrase with the present Gospel, if we understand *τάξις* of *chronological succession;* but the context does not sufficiently support that view of the writer's meaning to make it very *probable.*

Schleiermacher[c], Credner, Hase, Strauss, and others, taking advantage of the inapplicability of the phrase to the canonical Gospel of Mark, have maintained, that a succeeding writer composed the second Gospel, taking the imperfect work of Mark as its basis, and employing both written and oral sources. But this is a hazardous course, in the face of all ancient historical testimony, in which there is not the least hint of any other writer than Mark, or of a second author of the same name. "How could

[c] Studien und Kritiken, 1832, Heft. 4.

it happen," says Baur[d], " if there was originally a writing of Mark different from our Gospel of Mark, that in succeeding times the latter came into the place of the former without even the slightest historical notice of the mutual relation into which two compositions, different from one another, but still bearing the one name of Mark, came? As far as the matter is mentioned in the writings of the fathers usually quoted respecting the origin of Mark's Gospel, we must believe that one and the same work is always meant. Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius manifestly say, that they understand by the writing in question our present Gospel of Mark. Papias does not expressly call the work *a Gospel*, but he plainly presupposes the same mode of its origin as Clement and Eusebius describe. If then the work of Mark of which Papias speaks were not our present Gospel of Mark, how can it be supposed that this older writing of Mark should at once pass into oblivion, and that instead of it our present Gospel, springing up suddenly, should be regarded as the work of Mark that originated in the manner already mentioned? This cannot well be thought of." We presume that John the presbyter was not infallible; and nothing but a virtual assumption of his infallibility could induce us to have recourse to the expedient suggested by Schleiermacher. In the present instance, he appears to have been mistaken in his opinion. His power of perception was feeble, else he would have seen, that the Gospel which he describes as being written *οὐ τάξει*, does not differ materially in arrangement from that of Luke. Like Papias, the presbyter was apparently destitute of critical ability and good judgment, else he could not have entertained an idea so much at variance with fact.

It need not appear strange that we should find few express quotations from Mark's Gospel in the early fathers, because the document has very little peculiar to itself. Almost all its contents exist in the other Gospels, and no Christian sect could have been led by a specific doctrinal idiosyncrasy in the book, to adopt it in preference to the other Gospels. And yet Irenaeus alludes to a class of Christians who preferred it, from its fancied support of a distinction they made between Jesus and Christ.

Irenaeus expressly quotes and attributes to Mark the beginning

[d] Kritische Untersuchungen, p. 538.

and end of the Gospel:—Quapropter et Marcus interpres, et sectator Petri, initium evangelicae conscriptionis fecit sic: Initium evangelii Jesu Christi Filii Dei. . . . . In fine autem evangelii ait Marcus: Et quidem Dominus Jesus, postquam locutus est eis, receptus est in coelos, et sedet ad dexteram Dei[e]. "Wherefore also Mark, the interpreter and follower of Peter, made this the commencement of his evangelic writing: 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.' . . . . . And in the end of his Gospel Mark writes: 'And indeed the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them, was received up into heaven, and sits on the right hand of God.'"

Justin Martyr was acquainted with the Gospel before us. In his Dialogue with Trypho[f], he adduces a circumstance mentioned by Mark alone, that Jesus gave the sons of Zebedee a new name (Boanerges).

Tatian composed a Harmony made up of the four Gospels. Theodotus quotes Mark i. 13, in which it is stated that our Lord lived among wild beasts in the wilderness. Valentinus seems to have had a document containing the four Gospels, if we may judge from Tertullian's words:—Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur[g]. According to Irenaeus, the Valentinians referred to particulars in the history of the woman who had the issue of blood, which are given by Mark alone. It is also probable that Celsus was acquainted with our Gospel, for he speaks of *some* who represented only one angel as appearing at the sepulchre[h], a remark applicable to Matthew and Mark. Ptolemy cites ix. 5. It is needless to refer to the testimonies of Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and others, since it is admitted on all hands that they knew the Gospel of Mark, and reckoned it of canonical authority.

VI. Relation of the Gospel to Peter.

Here we must inquire, whether it was written before or after Peter's death; when he was with the writer, or when he was absent; whether the apostle sanctioned it by his authority; and how far it may justly claim apostolicity.

[e] Adv. Haeres. iii. 10, 6.
[f] Cap. 106.
[g] De praescriptione haeret. c. 38.
[h] Origen contra Cels. lib. v. c. 52.

On these points the testimony of early writers is inconsistent and unsatisfactory. The language of John the presbyter implies the absence of Peter when Mark wrote the Gospel. This is apparent from the words ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν, *as he remembered.*

If the word ἔξοδος, in Irenaeus, mean *decease*, as is most natural, then does the language of this father imply, that Mark wrote after Peter's death. But if it mean *departure*, it is possible to reconcile the testimony with that of other fathers.

According to Clement of Alexandria as already quoted, the Gospel was begun when Peter was alive and absent. When the apostle came to the knowledge of the fact, he neither forbade nor encouraged the undertaking.

Eusebius represents Mark as writing in the absence of Peter. The Spirit revealed to the apostle the fact of the Gospel being written; consequently Peter sanctioned the writing.

But in his Chronicle, the historian places the composition in the third year of Claudius, which must be an error.

Jerome translates the words of Eusebius almost literally; but in one place he represents Mark as writing at Peter's dictation:— Evangelium, Petro narrante et illo (Marco) scribente, compositum est[1].

Origen's language favours the idea of the apostle being present and directing the writer.

Although these varying notices furnish no *certain* basis for a conclusion, yet it may be inferred from them with some degree of probability, that Peter was not with Mark when the latter undertook to write the Gospel. Peter's hearers at Rome requested the evangelist to undertake the work. They wished to have a permanent record of the apostle's discourses, to which they might refer when he himself was not with them.

If the Gospel contain a faithful abstract of Peter's discourses, the writer having been exceedingly careful to omit nothing of what he had heard from the lips of his spiritual master, and to set down nothing falsely, as John the presbyter assures us, we may safely rely on it as ultimately based on apostolic authority. That Peter, if he were alive, should have allowed the Gospel to go into circulation, on the supposition of its incorrectness in the

[1] Ad Hedibiam, ii.

least particular, or the absence of Heaven's sanction, cannot for a moment be entertained. Nor would the early Christians have unhesitatingly adopted the book as sacred, had they been at all suspicious of its divine origin. They were satisfied with the belief of its truth and credibility, else they would have condemned it. They looked upon the writer as authorised to compose a narrative concerning Christ.

VII. Time and Place of writing.

It is impossible to ascertain the precise time when the Gospel was written. Two extremes however should be avoided—the idea that it is the most ancient of all the Gospels, as Weisse[k], Wilke[l], and B. Bauer[m] maintain; and the idea of Fritzsche[n], who conjectures that it was written last. Both opinions seem to us manifestly untenable, the truth lying between them.

1. The Paschal Chronicle, Gregory Syncellus, and Hesychius, place it A.D. 40.

2. According to Eusebius, in his Chronicon, it was written in the third year of Claudius, when Peter, Philo, and Simon were at Rome. This would bring the date to A.D. 43, ten years after the death of Christ. Many MSS. accordingly have a note at the conclusion, stating that the Gospel was written ten years after the ascension. No reliance is to be placed on this date, because the simultaneous appearance of Peter, Philo, and Simon, at Rome, has a fabulous character.

The two most ancient testimonies, viz. those of Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria contradict each other, the former stating the Gospel to have been composed after Peter's death, the latter while he was alive. Feilmoser would reconcile them, by supposing that the concluding part of Clement's testimony relative to Peter's tacit approval of Mark's undertaking is a later addition; and that although the writing was begun during the apostle's life, the completion of it did not take place till after his death. But this is a desperate remedy. Better is it to admit the irreconcilable nature of the two accounts, than to resort to such an

[k] Evangelische Geschichte, vol. i. p. 41, et seqq.
[l] Der Urevangelist, Dresden, 1838, 8vo.
[m] Kritik der evang. Gesch. d. Synoptiker, 1841.
[n] Prolegomena in Commentar. Marci, p. 47.

expedient, in order that they may be forced to agree. We prefer to follow the testimony of Irenaeus, which seems to place the composition after Peter's death; for if ἔξοδος be explained *departure*, and a consistency between Irenaeus and Clement be sought on this ground, as Ebrard proposes, we shall be brought to adopt the notion, that Peter had been at Rome previously to his arrival during Nero's reign. But it is very difficult to prove that he ever came to the imperial city, till he visited it for the first and last time.

The accounts of Irenaeus and Clement agree in this, that the Gospel was written in Rome after Peter's arrival in the imperial city, i. e. after the beginning of 63. It is impossible to determine the date more nearly than 64; and this is on the whole the most probable.

There is little in the Gospel itself which bears on the date of it. Venema[o] has adduced xvi. 18. as an argument for a late date, because he thinks that it contains a reference to the history in Acts xxviii. 3-6. Lardner, and after him Greswell, have directed attention to the twentieth verse of the same chapter, as proving that the apostles had left Judea, and preached in many places before Mark wrote. But as long as the authenticity of the last twelve verses of that chapter is doubtful, little weight can be attached to such considerations, were they even more important intrinsically than they really are.

The *place* of its origin was either Rome or Alexandria; but the weight of ancient testimony is in favour of the former. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, etc., assign it to Rome. Chrysostom is singular in fixing upon Egypt. Had this been the true locality, it is likely that some of the early Alexandrian fathers would have known it; but, on the contrary, Clement attributed it to Rome. In another passage, however, Chrysostom admits his ignorance of the true locality. Whether the Latinisms already adduced confirm the hypothesis which attributes it to Rome, is doubtful; though Hug and others rest on the circumstance. It is not conclusive. These Latinisms may prove that the Gospel was chiefly written for Roman converts, or that the writer had been *for a time* at Rome; but they do not

[o] Dissertatio secunda de titulo ep. ad Ephes. cap. 5, num. 4.

demonstrate that the Gospel was written there. The great majority of Protestant and Catholic writers unite in fixing on Rome rather than Alexandria, although some moderns have hesitated to pronounce a definite opinion.

It has been assumed by Simon[p] that there were two editions, one at each place, a hypothesis that reconciles the conflicting opinions. This is very improbable. As to its having appeared at Antioch, *that* hypothesis has been confined to Storr[q]. Eichhorn[r] refuted it.

VIII. Integrity.

The last eleven verses of the Gospel have been thought not to belong to it, or at least not to have been written by Mark. We shall notice, I. The external arguments against the authenticity of the paragraph, with the opposite arguments in its favour; and II. The internal considerations both against and for it.

I. The portion in question is wanting in the Cod. Vaticanus B, and marked with an asterisk in 137, 138. The Verona MS. of the Vetus Itala wants all after the seventh verse; perhaps also a fragment of the Moscow MS. g. omits the portion. In D., from the fifteenth verse to the end of the chapter, has proceeded from a later hand. The scholia of numerous MSS. mentioned by Griesbach, assert that it was absent from many copies, though they also assert that it existed in many others. A scholion belonging to the codices i. 206, 209 affirms, that Eusebius appended canons only as far as the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. Eusebius[s] himself writes:— *ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτὸ ἀθετῶν, εἴποι ἂν μὴ ἐν ἅπασιν αὐτὴν φέρεσθαι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου· τὰ γοῦν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων τὸ τέλος περιγράφει τῆς κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον ἱστορίας ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ ὀφθέντος νεανίσκου ταῖς γυναιξὶ καὶ εἰρηκότος αὐταῖς· μὴ φοβεῖσθε· Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν καὶ τοῖς ἑξῆς. καὶ ἀκούσασαι ἔφυγον, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. Ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου περιγέγραπται τὸ τέλος· τὰ δὲ ἑξῆς σπανίως*

[p] Kritische Schriften, vol. i. p. 171.
[q] Ueber den Zweck der evangelisch. Geschichte, etc. p. 278, et seqq.
[r] Einleit. vol. i. pp. 619, 575, et seqq.
[s] Ad Marin. Quaest. i. in Mai's Script. vet. nova collect. vol. i. p. 61.

ἔν τισιν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν φερόμενα πέριττα ἂν εἴη, καὶ μάλιστα εἴπερ ἔχοιεν ἀντιλογίαν τῇ τῶν λοίπων εὐαγγελιστῶν μαρτυρίᾳ. In like manner Gregory Nyssene, and Severus of Antioch say, that it was not in *the more accurate* MSS. of their day; while Victor of Antioch testifies that it was absent from *the greatest number.* A similar statement is made by Euthymius Zygabenus. Jerome writes: "Omnes Graeciae libros paene hoc capitulum in fine non habere." In the Catenae on Mark there is no explanation of the section. It is also wanting in the MSS. of the Armenian version; and accordingly, in the edition published at Venice it is separated from the rest of the Gospel as not properly belonging to it. In the other editions of that version however, it is printed as if it formed a part of the Gospel. It is wanting in an Arabic version in the Vatican library.

Again, the MSS. L. and 274, with the margin of the later Syriac version, have the following words after the eighth verse: *φέρεταί που καὶ ταῦτα· πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἐξήγγειλαν· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς* (*ἀνατολῶν* 274) *καὶ ἄχρι δύσεως ἐξαπέστειλε δι' αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας.* Then Cod. L. adds: *ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ταῦτα φερόμενα μετὰ τὸ ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ· ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωΐ κ. τ. λ.* This termination, manifestly proceeding from another pen than that of the evangelist, shews both the absence of the portion in question from many ancient copies, and the consequent feeling of incompleteness attaching to the Gospel.

Besides, in Cod. A. 127, 129, 132, 133, 134, 137, 169, 186, 188, 195, 371, and many other good MSS., the numbering of the Eusebian or Ammonian sections does not proceed beyond the eighth verse. 2. But it is affirmed on the other side, that all Greek MSS., with the exception of B., have the paragraph; all evangelistaria even the most ancient; and all synaxaria. The versions also have it, even the Syriac of Jerusalem. It is sanctioned by Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Dionysius of Alexandria, Tatian, Celsus, the author of the Synopsis, Cyril of Jerusalem, Damascenus, Photius, Theophylact, Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory, Cassian. Nestorius (ap. Cyril vi. 46), quotes the twentieth verse. In relation to Celsus, it is not certain whether he should be

quoted in favour of the passage or not. Many think that he might have founded his cavilling objection on John xx. 11, and Luke viii. 2, rather than Mark xvi. 9. It should also be noticed, that there is no trace of an acquaintance with it on the part of Clement of Rome, Clement of Alexandria, or Justin Martyr[t].

In relation to the weighty testimony of Jerome, Hug remarks, that the father himself restricts his statement in regard to the number of the MSS. in which the portion was not found; for he says (Dial. ii. Adv. Pelag. c. 15) that "in quibusdam exemplaribus, et maxime Graecis codicibus," there was an important various reading after the fourteenth verse. Hence Hug thinks that something should be attributed to the rhetorical style of the author in the former statement. But the assertion of Jerome amounts to no more, than that Greek MSS. constituted the greatest part (*maxime, pars maxima*) of those copies which had the portion. If, therefore, it was found only in *quibusdam exemplaribus, a part* of them must have been small.

In opposition to the weighty evidence of Eusebius against the paragraph, reference is made to Irenaeus, who was evidently acquainted with it:—"In fine autem evangelii ait Marcus; et quidem dominus Jesus postquam locutus est eis, receptus est in coelos, et sedet ad dextram Dei."

We are also reminded by Hug, that the Palestinian recension, according to Victor and the scholiasts, contained the portion.

Several writers favourable to the authenticity of the passage, have attributed the omission of it in so many ancient copies to *expositors*, rather than *critics*. The passage was supposed to contain statements contrary to the other evangelists, and was therefore rejected. Accordingly Euthymius says, that τινὲς τῶν ἐξηγητῶν could not reconcile it with the parallel account of Matthew. The chief difficulty in the view of these ancient interpreters lay in the ninth verse as compared with Matt. xxviii. 1. Unable to solve the difficulty, they concluded that the latter part of this chapter ought to be expunged. The defenders of the authenticity appeal to Gregory of Nyssa, Victor, Severus, and Jerome, who notice the discrepancy between Matthew and Mark in this particular.

[t] See Griesbach's Commentarius criticus, part ii. p. 201.

The words of the last writer are chiefly adduced: "Quae causa sit ut de resurrectione Domini et apparitione evangelistae diversa narraverint, in quibus primum quaeris, cur Matthaeus dixerit (xxviii. 1) vespere autem sabbati, etc., et Marcus (xvi. 9) cum autem resurrexisset; hujus quaestionis duplex solutio est. Aut enim non recipimus Marci testimonium quod in raris fertur evangeliis, omnibus Graeciae libris paene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus, praesertim cum diversa atque contraria evangelistis caeteris narrare videatur; aut hoc respondendum, quod uterque verum dixerit: Matthaeus quod Dominus surrexit *vespere* sabbati, Marcus autem, quando eum viderit Maria Magdalena, id est, *mane* primo sabbati[u]," etc.

Schott[x] thinks, that the cause assigned for the rejection of the section could not have been the sole, or even the principal one, because—

(*a*) The ancient fathers were acquainted with another punctuation and interpretation of the ninth verse, by means of which it was harmonised with the evangelists; and it is incredible that the majority of the early Christians were ignorant of this exposition. The Greeks, in particular, knew nothing of the difficulty of reconciling the discordant expressions of Matthew and Mark, but explained ὀψὲ σαββάτων in the former by ὀψὲ καιροῦ, ὀψὲ τῆς ὥρας. κ. τ. λ.

(*b*) Many other passages, apparently contradictory to parallel passages in other Gospels, were not for this reason omitted or expunged in ancient MSS.

(*c*) It cannot be proved by the express testimony of any ancient writer, that the section was erased for the purpose of removing the difficulty in the ninth verse. Jerome himself does not say so. He does not state, as Hug appears to think, that the Latins, unable to reconcile the discordant expressions of Matthew and Mark (*vespere* sabbati, and *mane* sabbati), tried to find an excuse for rejecting what they could not explain in the MSS. which wanted the passage. A twofold solution is proposed by the father himself. He does not state that the Latins were wont to think of the one solution. Had this been true, the passage must have been wanting in the Latin MSS., which is contrary to fact.

[u] Ad Hedibiam Quaest. 3. [x] Opuscula, vol. ii, p. 144, et seqq.

(*d*) Had any one despaired of defending the section against the enemies of Christianity, he would not have judged it necessary to expunge the whole. A very few verses might have been erased, or a few expressions altered. And then had it been originally cut off from the authentic Gospel, it is likely that the latter part of the eighth verse would not have been left. Perhaps the entire verse would have been expunged.

In the first and third of these considerations which have been adduced by Schott, there is considerable weight. So also in the fourth. The second possesses no force.

On the whole, the external arguments in favour of the paragraph outweigh those on the other side.

II. Internal considerations are urged against the authenticity.

1. It is strange that when Mark had called attention to the fact that Christ should appear to the disciples in Galilee (verse 7, and xiv. 28), he does not make the slightest allusion to the fulfilment of the promise. Matthew however follows an opposite course, by distinctly recording the promised meeting with the disciples on a mountain of Galilee (xxviii. 16-20). Olshausen indeed replies, that verses 15 to 18 in this chapter of Mark *do* relate that very appearance of Jesus in Galilee, as is obvious from Matthew xxviii. 16, etc. But we hesitate to admit the correctness of this summary answer. We cannot suppose that verses 15 to 18 refer to the appearance in Galilee, although such was the view also of Calvin, Chemnitz, Bengel, Paulus, and others. The best harmonists, as Clausen, Greswell, and Robinson, refer the passage to Jerusalem or its vicinity.

2. A new section begins with the 9th verse, as appears from the new note of time prefixed; but at the 2nd verse of the chapter, a note of time had been already introduced. And yet the events recorded in the 9th and subsequent verses require no new section, and no new note of time.

3. There is an incoherence between the 9th verse and the preceding section. The words *πρωΐ πρώτῃ σαββάτου* most naturally belong to the participle *ἀναστὰς*, since the author, in describing the appearances of Jesus, has no regard to place or time (comp. 12, 14, 15, 19). Thus the Saviour is said to have risen *early*,

πρωΐ; although the women who visited the sepulchre *very early*, λίαν πρωΐ, learned that he had risen *before* their visit (verse 4).

Again, πρῶτον connected with ἐφάνη is not appropriate, because the appearance to Mary Magdalene was not the first. Hence Robinson is obliged to resort to the explanation that πρῶτον is put here not *absolutely* but *relatively; the first* of the three appearances of our Lord which Mark narrates. But this explanation is forced and unnatural. We are referred, indeed, by Robinson, in justification of it, to 1 Cor. xv. 5-8, and John xxi. 14; but the cases are not parallel. His argument, too, founded on ὕστερον (verse 14) is inapposite. It would have been appropriate had ὕστατον, the superlative, been employed.

4. The phraseology and style of the section are adverse to its authenticity. The characteristic peculiarities which pervade the Gospel do not appear in it; but, on the contrary, terms and expressions never employed by Mark are introduced; or terms instead of which others are used by him. Thus for πρώτῃ σαββάτου, (verse 9), Mark has the plural σαββάτων (xvi. 2), but never the singular. Luke however has the singular (xviii. 12) in the sense of *week;* so that the evangelist *might have employed* the singular. But the adjective πρώτη he would scarcely have used. It should have been μίᾳ or τῇ μίᾳ τῶν σαββάτων, as is proved by Mark xvi. 2, and all parallel passages (Matt. xxviii. 1; Luke xxiv. 1; John xx. 1; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2). The expression could scarcely have proceeded from a Jew. It betrays a Gentile author. Ἀφ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια is attached to the name of Mary Magdalene, although she had been mentioned three times in the preceding context without that appendix. It seems to have been taken from Luke viii. 2. Instead of ἐκβάλλειν ἀπό, Mark uses ἐκβάλλειν ἐκ (vii. 26). In the 10th and 14th verses there are sentences without a copulative; whereas Mark always has the copulative in such cases, particularly καί. The use of ἐκεῖνος in verses 10, 11, and 13 (twice), in a manner synonymous with ὁ δὲ (comp. Mark iv. 11; vii. 15, 20; xii. 4, 5; xiv. 21), is peculiar. The verb πορεύεσθαι is used three times in this section, although the evangelist never employs it elsewhere. Θεᾶσθαι is also a term unknown to Mark (verses 11, 14). So also ἀπιστεῖν

(verses 11, 16). *Μετὰ ταῦτα* (in the 12th verse), is never employed by Mark. *Ὁ μὲν κύριος—ἐκεῖνος δὲ* (verses 19 and 20): here the *μὲν* and *δὲ* corresponding to each other in the two members, are a form of expression too artificial for Mark's simple style. It occurs but once in the Gospel (xiv. 38), where the words of another person are cited. *Ὁ κύριος* is used in the 19th and 20 verses instead of *Ἰησοῦς*. Mark no where employs this appellation. *Ἕτερος* (verse 12), is not employed by Mark. The same remark is applicable to *παρακολουθέω, βλάπτω, πανταχοῦ, ἐπακολουθέω, συνεργέω, βεβαιόω. Πᾶσα κτίσις* is Pauline; *κόσμον ἅπαντα* is peculiar (comp. viii. 36; xiv. 9): *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* (verse 17), instead of *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι* (comp. ix. 37, 41; xiii. 6): *χεῖρας ἐπιθεῖναι ἐπί τινα*, instead of the dative (comp. v. 23; vi. 5; vii. 32; viii. 23). Other peculiarities and *ἅπαξ λεγομένα* may be accounted for by the newness of the subject, such as *γλώσσαις καιναις λαλεῖν, ὄφεις αἴρειν, θανάσιμον πίνειν, καλῶς ἔχειν, φανεροῦσθαι.*

The style of the whole piece is unlike that of the Gospel. Instead of the graphic, detailed description by which the evangelist is distinguished, we meet with an abrupt, sententious manner, resembling that of brief notices extracted from larger accounts and loosely linked together.

5. The seventeenth and eighteenth verses contain various suspicious circumstances. The desire of the miraculous is too great for Mark. The kind of miracles indicated, and the power of performing them attributed to *all believers* are adverse to the supposition of the evangelist being the writer. Thus the handling of deadly serpents with impunity, and the drinking of deadly poison without harm, savour of the superstition that prevailed after the apostles. The ability to speak in foreign languages was taken from what is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

6. The words "he that believeth and *is baptised*, shall be saved" (verse 16), are very suspicious. The writer seems to have taken *καὶ βαπτισθείς* from Matthew xxviii. 19; but the insertion of the clause in this place, in its present form, is not warranted by any other passage of the New Testament. It reminds us of the post-apostolic period, when a greater efficacy was attributed to baptism than it was intended to have.

It is difficult to arrive at a proper decision of the question before

us. That the paragraph is suspicious, even on external grounds, it were idle to deny, although external testimony of itself preponderates in favour of the authenticity. Internal considerations, however, are against it. The manner, style, and phraseology, are foreign to Mark. What judgment then, has the critic to pronounce? The concluding words of the eighth verse, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, are truly styled by Griesbach *clausula abruptissima;* while he justly declares, "omnibus incredibile videri debebat, Marcum sic finivisse commentariolum suum." If Mark left off writing at the eighth verse, he could scarcely have intended to stop there, unless compelled to break off by some unexpected accident. What that accident was, we can never ascertain. We are left to mere conjecture. Why Mark was suddenly interrupted, belongs to the unknown facts connected with the literary history of the New Testament. According to Michaelis, the death of Peter his voucher, was the cause of the abrupt termination; but this is most improbable. The evangelist was not absolutely and solely dependent on Peter for the materials of the Gospel. He was not *the amanuensis* of the apostle. Perhaps Mark's death was the cause. Intending to finish the Gospel, he was not allowed to write any more. Copies were taken of the document as the author had left it. But some unknown person appended the conclusion; and the complete copies soon came to outnumber the incomplete.

We are aware that a different hypothesis has found favour with some; viz., that the evangelist himself added the section at another time, by summarily winding up the narrative. Prevented from completing it with a copiousness of detail corresponding to that of the Gospel itself, it is supposed that he subjoined a brief condensed statement by way of conclusion. Thus the difference of style is accounted for by the haste with which the writer annexed the closing verses. He passed from one method to another, and rapidly brought the work to a termination.

But we are still disposed to believe, that the termination was added by another person, after Mark's death. Whether the writer in so doing made use of the other Gospels, or a brief synopsis of Peter's narrative, can scarcely be determined with certainty. The former seems to us much more probable; for several expressions

appear to have been taken from other Gospels, especially Luke and John. Fritzsche has endeavoured to shew, with considerable success, the origin of the writer's expressions. In any case, the interval between Mark's death and the attaching of the eleven verses was not long; although copies must have been taken from the work as left by the inspired writer.

Critics have been very much divided in opinion respecting the paragraph before us, so that dogmatism would be exceedingly inappropriate regarding it. Its authenticity is doubted or denied by Michaelis, Teller, Bolten, Thiess, Griesbach, Gratz, Bertholdt, Schulthess, Schott (Isagoge), Henneberg, Fritzsche, Credner, Schulz, Wieseler, Norton, Neudecker, Reuss, De Wette; but defended by Osiander, Simon, Fabricius, Glassius, Mill, Storr, Matthaei, Paulus, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Eichhorn, Hug[y](?), Feilmoser, Vater, Saunier, Olshausen, Guerike, and others.

We shall only *mention* another portion of Mark, which some have rejected; viz., the first thirteen verses of the Gospel. External and internal testimony is too strong in favour of the authenticity of this portion to induce any to oppose it, except the hypercritical. According to Reuss, it is a recapitulation of the history of the Baptist, with the baptism and temptation of Jesus. He admits however that the section is very ancient, and that it was taken from good sources. But there is as much evidence in favour of its authenticity as of the authenticity of any other part of the Gospel. To reject it, is to throw aside the value of testimony, and to follow an arbitrary caprice. We cannot for a moment entertain the belief that the portion in question is supposititious.

IX. Contents.

The Gospel of Mark may be divided into three parts: —

1. The transactions preparatory to the public ministry of Christ.
2. His ministry in Galilee.
3. His last journey to Jerusalem, with the events that transpired in the city.

[y] In the new edition of Hug's Einleitung, published since the author's decease, the entire section relating to Mark xvi. 9-20, inserted in his third edition, is omitted. Probably therefore he had altered his opinion. We have not thought it necessary to omit all reference to his statements in favour of the authenticity, since other critics appear to have rested on them.

1. The first part relates to the preaching and baptism of John, the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan, and the temptation in the wilderness (i. 1-13).

2. (i. 14—x). Here are recorded the transactions between the first and second passover (i. 15—ii. 22), the events between the second and third (ii. 23—vi. 56), and those subsequent to the third, till His arrival at Bethany, immediately before the fourth passover (vii.—x. 52).

3. The third part describes His entry into Jerusalem, His passion, death, resurrection, and the subsequent occurrences (xi.—xvi. 20).

The order of events agrees much oftener with Luke than Matthew. Occasionally the writer deviates from both. Some transactions, such as Levi's feast, are manifestly out of their true chronological position.

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

We shall consider:—

I. The Author.
II. The Preface.
III. Relation of the Gospel to the Apostle Paul.
IV. For whom it was written in the first instance.
V. Characteristics.
VI. Time and Place.
VII. Authenticity.
VIII. Integrity.
IX. Contents.

I. The Author.

The author of the third Gospel is named *Luke* (*Λουκᾶς*), an abbreviated form of *Lucanus* (*Λουκανὸς*), in the same manner as *Silas* is formed from *Silvanus*. Paul mentions *Luke, the beloved physician;* and it is probable that he was the same person with Luke the evangelist. Some indeed have doubted or denied their identity—as Calvin, S. Basnage, and Heumann; but the grounds they allege are scarcely sufficient to justify their denial. The fathers generally — Eusebius, Jerome, Chrysostom — appear to have identified them. So also most critics of modern times. Some have even discovered indications of the writer's profession in the Gospel and Acts; such as the expression *πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ* (iv. 38), which Galen uses in speaking of fever; *ἀχλὺς* (Acts xiii. 11), a technical term denoting *blindness*, also employed by Galen. But little reliance can be placed on these circumstances. The expressions are not confined to medical science or medical writers; and surely one who is not a physician or surgeon by profession, may employ words exactly applicable to the state of a sick person.

Little is known of Luke's history before he became associated with the apostle in missionary labours. Lardner thinks he was a Jew for two reasons; *first*, as he constantly attended St. Paul, the Jews, especially at Jerusalem, would have reproached the apostle if his companion had been an uncircumcised Gentile; but we no where find an account of any such exceptions having been

made to him. *Secondly*, St. Luke follows the Jewish computation of time, and mentions the Jewish festivals, as in Acts xii. 3; xx. 6, 16; xxvii. 9. These arguments, however, as Michaelis has well remarked, are not decisive; the first depending on the mere silence of the historian, who modestly refrains on all occasions from speaking of himself; while the second merely implies an acquaintance with Jewish customs and modes of computation, which may well be predicated of a heathen historian, a man of reading and education, who had accompanied Paul, and come in contact with the Jews so often. He was probably of Gentile origin, if we may judge from Coloss. iv. 11, 14, where Paul, having saluted several persons—Aristarchus, Marcus, Jesus Justus —adds, that they were *of the circumcision*, separating them in this manner from those mentioned immediately afterwards, among whom is Luke. It would therefore appear, that he was of heathen parents. Some have conjectured that one of his parents was a Gentile and the other a Jew, for which no reason can be assigned. It is doubtful whether he was a proselyte to Judaism before his conversion to Christianity; for the distinction made in Coloss. iv. 11, 14 is adverse. Had he been a proselyte of righteousness, he would certainly have been classed with *them of the circumcision;* and if a proselyte of the gate, he would probably have been put in the same position.

It has been assumed that he was a manumitted slave, probably because the Greeks and Romans were accustomed to educate some of their domestics in the science of medicine, to whom freedom was granted for services performed. Many examples of this practice might be collected from heathen writers. Thus Antonius Musa, physician of Augustus, was a freedman. So also Antistius, surgeon of Julius Cæsar, and others whom it is unnecessary to notice. But yet there may have been, and doubtless there were, some physicians who were free-born; so that the mere fact of Luke's being a physician, does not necessarily imply the fact of his having been a slave to whom liberty had been granted.

It is asserted by Eusebius and Jerome that he was a Syrian, a native of Antioch. We know nothing certain, however, of his native place, or of the locality in which he resided before attaching himself to the apostle of the Gentiles. Greswell con-

jectures that he was a native or inhabitant of *Philippi*, while others prefer Troas. His history in the Acts of the Apostles is first connected with Paul's history at Troas: thus much is certain; but whether he became acquainted there with the apostle *for the first time*, or was converted by him at that place, it is needless to inquire. There are no data for forming a probable view of the circumstances, place, or instrument of his conversion. As his name is a Greek one, he was in all probability a Greek; and therefore the inhabitants of his native city were also Greeks.

Luke attached himself to Paul at Troas, while the latter was on his second missionary tour. We afterwards find him at Philippi; and, towards the conclusion of the apostle's third missionary tour, Luke was with him at Troas, Miletus, Tyre, Caesarea, Jerusalem. At Caesarea, where Paul was a prisoner, his faithful friend did not desert him; for although perhaps he did not accompany him thither, yet it is probable that he followed him (Acts xxiv. 23), and was with him towards the close of his confinement. It is certain that he accompanied him to Rome. The latter part of Luke's life is involved in impenetrable obscurity. The accounts given of it by ecclesiastical writers, are neither consistent with themselves nor probable. They partake of a fabulous character, which is obvious from the additional circumstances introduced in the progress of time. According to Epiphanius[a], he preached chiefly in Gaul. Isidore of Seville[b] relates, that he died in the seventy-fourth year of his age, was buried in Bithynia, and that his bones were afterwards conveyed to Constantinople. Gregory of Nazianzen[c] enumerates a list of martyrs, in which his name appears, an opinion found in Hippolytus, Nicephorus, Glycas, Paulinus of Nola, and others. It was thought by many however that he died a natural death.

II. The Preface.

The proem forms a very valuable, though brief introduction to the Gospel itself. Yet it has been tortured by theorisers in various ways. The speculations of ingenious men have often put into it too much meaning. We learn from it:—

1. That many attempts had been made to give a fixed

[a] Advers. Haeres. 51. [b] De ortu et obitu patrum, c. 82 [c] Oratio iii. advers. Jul.

character in writing to the oral evangelical tradition before Luke commenced to write. Such persons are distinguished from "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word;" that is, from apostles and the seventy disciples of Christ. Who they were, is mere matter of conjecture. That they were members of different Gentile churches planted by Paul and his fellow-labourers, is most probable. Attempts of this kind were naturally to be looked for from persons possessing a portion of Grecian culture, who had not been long acquainted with the facts of the Gospel, because they did not live within the sphere where they were current. The embryo Gospels in question were doubtless undertaken with an honest intention, and contained much truth. It is altogether probable that they were of less extent than any of the canonical documents, though no account of their character or contents be extant. They may be supposed to have resembled other human compositions, not perfectly accurate, but marked with errors or marred by defects.

2. The qualifications which Luke possessed for writing a Gospel. He had traced up all things accurately to their sources (*παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς*); agreeably to which, he starts from earlier facts than the other evangelists. He had investigated the subject from its origin, and carefully separated the true from the false. He had employed upon it much diligent research.

3. The mode in which he proposes to write. He proposes to write *in order* (*καθεξῆς*). But here the question arises, *What kind of order?* Is it chronological? Beza, Olshausen, Greswell, and others, reply in the affirmative. This however is doubtful; for on close examination it will be found, that Luke does not always maintain chronological order. Olshausen himself concedes, that the writer forsakes chronological succession in certain particulars; so that although he *intended* to observe such a method *on the whole*, the minor details are not so arranged. This supposition is totally inadmissible. If Luke purposed to write in chronological order, he purposed to write throughout in that method; for he has made no limitation or exception. And if he had *the purpose* to write chronologically, he had also *the ability*.

In illustration of our opinion that the evangelist did not mean to write his Gospel chronologically, it is only necessary to consult

ix. 51—xviii. 14, a part of the Gospel presenting great difficulties to the harmonist. Here a number of events are narrated, which we cannot suppose to be arranged in chronological succession. Our Lord is about to leave Galilee for the last time; and the evangelist takes occasion to bring together a body of matter belonging both to the former and subsequent parts of his ministry *in* Galilee, and *out* of it. The entire portion, when placed beside Matthew and Mark, can scarcely be reckoned chronological, without introducing inextricable confusion, and impugning the credibility of the latter evangelists. Thus the incidents narrated in ix. 52-56, and 57-62, must have occurred *earlier* than their present position would lead us at first sight to suppose; while that related in 57-62 happened *before* that in 52-56. It is unnecessary to prove what almost all harmonists of the present day admit. Wieseler indeed has laboured to shew that Luke wrote chronologically; for which purpose he has tried to harmonise this difficult portion of Luke's Gospel with John's statements in the fourth; but, though his sagacity and learning are conspicuous throughout the inquiry, we cannot follow Thiersch in pronouncing it successful. Hence *καθεξῆς* must signify *with order, methodically*, without implying strict chronological succession. Both Wahl and Bretschneider explain it *ordine, continua serie.*

4. Is blame involved in the verb *ἐπεχείρησαν?* So it has been assumed very generally, since the time of Origen. It is doubtful, however, whether the word itself contain censure. The only blame which can be supposed to attach to the productions of the *πολλοὶ* lies in the context rather than in the single term. And then the blame is indirect and slight. It was not Luke's purpose to find fault with the writers, since their intention appears to have been good and laudable. But the fact of his undertaking to write after them shews, that they had not fully succeeded in their endeavours. They had failed in some respects. They are tacitly charged with deficiency, in regard to *τὸ παρακολουθεῖν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς, τὸ καθεξῆς*, and *ἀσφάλεια.* Hence Luke was prompted to write another Gospel.

We are now prepared to answer the question, whether Matthew and Mark be included in the *πολλοί.* Hug and De Wette suppose that they are; while the latter scholar would also include

the Gospel of the Hebrews in the attempts of *the many*, though not the later apocryphal Gospels of Thomas, Matthias, etc. This opinion seems to us improbable. The idea contained in the verb ἐπεχείρησαν with its context, viz., that these writers did not succeed in their endeavours, prevents us from classing the canonical Gospels of Matthew and Mark along with theirs. It can never be shewn that our present Gospels are justly liable to indirect censure of the slightest kind, or chargeable with any imperfection.

Besides, Luke makes a distinction between these πολλοί and the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου, or the apostles and immediate disciples of Christ; so that Matthew and Mark are excluded; the former *certainly*, the latter *probably*, unless he belonged to the seventy disciples, which Papias expressly denies. It should also be mentioned, that Luke wrote *before* Mark, as De Wette himself allows, a circumstance which necessarily excludes the latter from the πολλοί.

Thus all considerations combine to shew, that neither the Greek nor Hebrew Matthew, nor Mark, belonged to the πολλοί; nor yet apocryphal Gospels, such as those of Matthias and Nicodemus. The latter did not appear so early; and even if they had been written, they would have been more directly censured by Luke.

5. The relation of Luke's Gospel to the works of the *many*.

It is not stated in the Proem that the compositions of the many were the source from which Luke drew his materials either wholly or in part, although that has been often assumed. No connection between them and the work of Luke is affirmed. The passage merely announces the existence of such apocryphal compositions. They were accessible to the writer. We must therefore reason from the nature of the case as to the probability of their being employed by Luke as sources. In his diligent research and careful investigation of the subject on which he was about to write, it is natural to suppose that he would employ them. They must have contained much that was true; nor do they seem to have been undertaken from any suspicious motive. Their well-meaning authors conceived that they should promote the interests of Christianity by writing them.

Another source of information is hinted at by Luke in this preface, although not expressly stated as such; viz. eye and ear-

witnesses who testified *orally* to the reality of the events narrated. The apocryphal Gospels had been probably derived from these original witnesses and ministers, many of whom were still living, proclaiming the fact that such things were said and done by Jesus. These then were the two sources accessible to Luke; written Gospels or *digests*, and oral accounts, of which it is probable he availed himself.

6. The language obviously implies, that Luke himself was not an original eye-witness; and therefore not of the seventy disciples. Neither the writers of the existing apocryphal Gospels, nor he himself belonged to the company of apostles and disciples of Jesus, but had rather been converted by the latter, and relied on their testimony. Hence the author of the Dialogue *De recta in Deum fide*, Hippolytus, and others, are mistaken in characterising Luke as one of the seventy.

III. Relation of Luke's Gospel to Paul.

It is manifest from the New Testament, that Luke was the companion and favourite, if not the spiritual son of Paul. The attachment of both parties was mutual and close. Hence arose the opinion which existed early in the church, and was uniformly handed down, that Luke wrote his Gospel under the superintending influence of the apostle. It is easy to account for the indirect derivation of the Gospel from Paul. There is reason to believe that the early fathers looked upon apostolic origin as necessary to the reception of a book into the canon. The transition from being a disciple of the apostle, to the act of writing the Gospel beneath apostolic inspection, was natural. Thus the Gospel of Luke was counted the Gospel of Paul *virtually*.

The tradition respecting the close connection of Luke's Gospel with the apostle Paul is embodied in the following quotations. Irenaeus writes:—*Λουκᾶς δὲ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο*[d].

"And Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the Gospel preached by him (Paul)."

And in another place:—Quoniam autem is Lucas inseparabilis fuit a Paulo, et cooperarius ejus in Evangelio, ipse facit

[d] Advers. Haeres. iii. 1.

manifestum, etc. . . . . Sic apostoli simpliciter, et nemini invidentes, quae didicerant ipsi a Domino, haec omnibus tradebant. Sic igitur et Lucas, nemini invidens, ea quae ab eis didicerat, tradidit nobis, sicut ipse testificatur, dicens: Quemadmodum tradiderunt nobis qui ab initio contemplatores, et ministri fuerunt verbi[e].

"That Luke was inseparable from Paul and his fellow-labourer in the Gospel is shewn by himself, etc. etc. Thus the apostles simply, and without envying any one, handed down these things which they themselves had learned from the Lord, to all. Thus therefore Luke also, without envy to any one, has handed down to us those things which he had learned from them, as he testifies when he says, 'even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word.'"

Tertullian says:—Constituimus imprimis evangelicum instrumentum apostolos auctores habere, quibus hoc munus evangelii promulgandi ab ipso Domino sit impositum. Si et apostolicos, non tamen solos, sed cum apostolis et post apostolos, quoniam praedicatio discipulorum suspecta fieri posset de gloriae studio, si non adsistat illi autoritas magistrorum, imo Christi, qui magistros apostolos fecit . . . . . Igitur si ipse illuminator Lucae (Paulus) autoritatem antecessorum et fidei et praedicationi suae optavit, quanto magis eam evangelio Lucae expostulem, quae evangelio magistri ejus fuit necessaria"[f]?

"In the first place, we lay it down as a truth, that the evangelic Scriptures have for their authors the apostles, to whom the work of publishing the Gospel was committed by the Lord himself. And if also it have for authors apostolic men, not them alone, but with the apostles and after the apostles, since the preaching of the disciples might have been suspected as liable to the charge of a desire of glory, if not supported by the authority of the masters, yea of Christ, who made the apostles masters . . . . . Therefore if Luke's instructor himself wished to have the authority of his predecessors both for his faith and preaching, how much more may I desire it for Luke's Gospel, which was necessary for the Gospel of his master?"

In another place Tertullian has these words:—Nam et

[e] Advers. Haeres. iii. 14. secs. 1, 2.

[f] Advers. Marcion, lib. iv. c. 2.

Lucae digestum Paulo adscribere solent. Capit magistrorum videri quae discipuli promulgarint[g].

"For Luke's digest is usually ascribed to Paul. It is easy to take that for the master's, which the disciples have published."

Origen writes:—*καὶ τρίτον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν τὸ ὑπὸ Παύλου ἐπαινούμενον εὐαγγέλιον*[h].

"The third is that according to Luke, the Gospel commended by Paul," etc. etc.

Eusebius the historian writes:—*Λουκᾶς δὲ τὸ μὲν γένος ὢν τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας τὴν δὲ ἐπιστήμην ἰατρός, τὰ πλεῖστα συγγεγονὼς τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς δὲ οὐ παρέργως τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡμιληκὼς ἧς ἀπὸ τούτων προσεκτήσατο ψυχῶν θεραπευτικῆς, ἐν δυσὶν ἡμῖν ὑποδείγματα θεοπνεύστοις καταλέλοιπε βιβλίοις. τῷ τε εὐαγγελίῳ ὃ καὶ χαράξαι μαρτύρεται καθὰ παρέδοσαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἀπαρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, οἷς καὶ φησὶν ἐπάνωθεν ἅπασι παρηκολουθηκέναι καὶ ταῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων πράξεσιν ἃς οὐκέτι δι' ἀκοῆς, ὀφθαλμοῖς δὲ αὐτοῖς παραλαβὼν συνετάξατο, φασὶ δὲ ὡς ἄρα τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελίου μνημονεύειν ὁ Παῦλος εἴωθεν, ὑπηνίκα ὡς περὶ ἰδίου τινὸς εὐαγγελίου γράφων ἔλεγε, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου*[i].

"And Luke, who was a native of Antioch, and by profession a physician, for the most part a companion of Paul, and who was not slightly acquainted with the rest of the apostles, has left us in two books divinely inspired, proofs of the art of healing souls which he acquired from them. One of these is the Gospel, which he professes to have written as they delivered it to him, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, with all whom, he says likewise, he had been perfectly acquainted from the beginning. The other book is the Acts of the Apostles, which he composed now, not from what he had heard, but from what he had seen with his own eyes. And *it is said*, that Paul was accustomed to mention the Gospel according to him, whenever, in his epistles, speaking as it were of some Gospel of his own, he says. According to my Gospel."

From this language it would appear, that Eusebius did not believe the current tradition.

Jerome writes:—Lucas medicus Antiochensis, ut ejus scripta

[g] Advers. Marcion, lib. iv. c. 5. [h] Ap. Euseb. H. E. vi. 25. [i] H. E. iii. 4.

indicant, Graeci sermonis non ignarus fuit, sectator apostoli Pauli, et omnis peregrinationis ejus comes. Scripsit evangelium, de quo idem Paulus: misimus, inquit, cum illo, fratrem cujus laus est in evangelio per omnes ecclesias . . . . . Quidam suspicantur quotiescunque in epistolis suis Paulus dicit: juxta evangelium meum, de Lucae significare volumine: et Lucam non solo ab apostolo Paulo didicisse evangelium, qui cum domino in carne non fuerat, sed et a caeteris apostolis. Quod ipse quoque in principio sui voluminis declarat, dicens: sicut tradiderunt nobis qui a principio ipsi viderunt et ministri fuerunt sermonis. Igitur evangelium, sicut audierat, scripsit[k].

"Luke, a physician of Antioch, not unskilled in the Hebrew language, as his writings shew, a disciple of the apostle Paul, and the constant companion of his travels, wrote a Gospel, of which the same Paul makes mention, saying: We have sent with him the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches. . . . . Some suppose, that whenever Paul in his epistles makes use of the expression, *according to my Gospel*, he means Luke's writing. It is also supposed that Luke did not learn his Gospel from the apostle Paul only, who had not conversed with the Lord in the flesh, but also from other apostles, which likewise he declares in the beginning of his Gospel, saying, 'As they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word.' Therefore he wrote the Gospel as he had heard it from others."

In the Synopsis of the Pseudo-Athanasius, the idea is put more strongly:—Evangelium secundum Lucam dictatum quidem est ab apostolo Paulo, conscriptum vero et editum a Luca beato apostolo et medico[l].

"The Gospel according to Luke was dictated indeed by Paul, but written and published by Luke the beloved apostle and physician." This remark has been appended in Greek to several MSS. of Luke's Gospel, as we learn from Scholz.

In consequence of this tradition, confirmation of its truth has been sought in the New Testament itself. Nor has ingenuity failed to discover indications of it, although the sacred writings are barren in proofs of the alleged fact. Thus the account of the

[k] De Viris illustr. c. 7.

[l] In Athanasii Opp.

Lord's Supper is strictly accordant with that of Paul in the eleventh chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians. Again, such sayings and discourses of Jesus are selected as partake of a Pauline character, exhibiting the comprehensive views of the Gospel by which that apostle was distinguished, as in iv. 25, etc.; ix. 52; x. 30, etc.; xvii. 16, 18; ix. 3-5. In like manner, the proper explanation of Colos. i. 20 coincides remarkably with a statement made by Luke alone respecting the announcement of Jesus' birth by a multitude of the heavenly host (ii. 14). We find also selections from the evangelical materials favourable to the doctrine of justification by faith alone (xvii. 10; xv. 11, etc.; xviii. 14). There is, moreover, a coincidence between Luke iii. 15, 16, and part of a speech of Paul relating to a fact in the ministry of John the Baptist.

It must be candidly admitted, that the tradition in question rests on no good foundation. Luke himself has said nothing in the preface respecting the Pauline origin of his Gospel. He speaks simply of the facts and doctrines constituting the evangelical history being orally handed down to himself and contemporary Christians by eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. As far as this oral tradition was employed by him, it could scarcely be attributed specifically to Paul as its author. It must have been distributed among other apostles and disciples of Christ. The proofs of accordance between Pauline sentiments and certain peculiarities observable in Luke's writings, are no evidence of the fact that the apostle was the principal author of the Gospel, or that he was in any sense the author of it. All that can be legitimately inferred from them is, that Luke was Paul's disciple—that he had been instructed in the truth by the apostle of the Gentiles. The Gospel however does not rest on the apostolic basis of Paul, for it cannot be shewn that he superintended the composition of it, much less that he directed the evangelist in writing it or dictated any part. Historical criticism repudiates these assumptions as gratuitous. Hence the tradition we have been considering wants a solid foundation. The New Testament, so far from favouring, is rather adverse to it; while the Pauline sentiments in the Gospel, to which allusion has been made, prove, at most, that Luke had been instructed by

Paul, perhaps no more than that his ideas of the evangelical history coincided with those of the great apostle.

On the whole, Luke's Gospel is not of canonical authority because of the special influence which Paul had upon it. Its credibility and authority must be placed on another basis equally secure. That it fully deserves its present position among the Gospels is unquestionable; but it does *not* deserve it by virtue of any truth in the ancient tradition.

IV. For whom it was written in the first instance.

The immediate purpose for which Luke wrote was the instruction of Theophilus. Who Theophilus was it is difficult to determine. That he was not a native or inhabitant of Palestine may be inferred from such passages as i. 26; ii. 4; iv. 31; viii. 26; xxiii. 51; xxiv. 13; Acts i. 12, 18, etc. Neither was he a Jew, as is evident from ii. 22-24; iv. 6; Acts xxiii. 5. Theodore Hase[m] and Michaelis[n] conjecture that he may have been the deposed high-priest Theophilus, mentioned by Josephus[o], son of the Annas spoken of in the Gospels; but this is utterly improbable. To whatever country he belonged, he was a Gentile, as is shewn by the explanatory circumstances appended by Luke to several things in his Gospel. The document then was primarily written for the instruction of Theophilus, a Gentile believer, that he might have a consecutive history in all respects true and faithful, on whose certainty he could rely with confidence. But this circumstance does not exclude a wider purpose. Doubtless the Gospel was intended, if not by the writer himself, at least by the Holy Spirit, for the instruction of contemporaries, and of future ages. The general purpose is not incompatible with the particular; nor is the primary object inconsistent with the ulterior. Theophilus was a member of the primitive church, and his spiritual exigencies represented those of contemporaneous and successive believers. For them also the work was designed, to instruct them in the faith, and to give them assurance of the leading facts in the evangelical history, that they might not be left to the dubious light of unauthoritative productions. Internal evidence proves

[m] Biblioth. Bremen. Cl. iv. Fascic, 4.
[n] Introd. trans. by Marsh, vol. iii. p. 238, 2nd ed. [o] Antiqq. libb. xviii.-xx.

that Luke wrote for a Gentile community. This was to be expected from a companion of the apostle of the Gentiles, who had witnessed marvellous changes in the condition of many heathens by the reception of the Gospel.

Many of his explanations would have been unnecessary for Jews. Thus (xxii. 1) "Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, *which is called the Passover.*" (xxi. 37) "And at night he went out, and abode in the mount *that is called the mount of Olives.*" (iv. 31) "And came down to Capernaum, *a city of Galilee,*" etc. (i. 26) "Unto *a city of Galilee named* Nazareth." (xxiii. 51) "He was of Arimathea, *a city of the Jews,*" etc. (viii. 26) "And they arrived at the country of the Gadarenes, *which is over against Galilee.*" (xxiv. 13) "And behold two of them went the same day to a village called Emmaus, *which was from Jerusalem about three-score furlongs.*" He also puts Greek *first* in the inscription over the cross, whereas John puts Hebrew in the same place.

Luke further traces up the genealogy of Jesus to Adam, the common parent of the human family, while Matthew traces it to Abraham. The reigns of Roman emperors too, are employed for marking the date of Jesus' birth and John's preaching.

Hence also the writer's partiality for such sayings and discourses as bear a commendatory aspect towards the Gentiles. Thus the words of Simeon are recorded (ii. 32), "A light to lighten the Gentiles," etc. Hence too the account of the widow of Sarepta, and of Naaman the Syrian (iv. 25-27); the parable of the benevolent Samaritan (x. 30-37); the gratitude of the Samaritan leper (xvii. 11-19); and Jesus' rebuke of a revengeful spirit towards the Samaritans (ix. 51-56).

In accordance with the preceding particulars, Luke omits circumstances which would have been of no interest to the Gentiles. Thus in vi. 31 there is no appeal to the Jewish law, as there is in Matthew vii. 12. At the commencement of the prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, the evangelist does not say with Matthew, that Jesus uttered that remarkable prediction "as he sat upon the mount of Olives;" nor with Mark, "as he sat over against the temple;" but simply records the prophecy itself. Again, while Matthew in referring to the Old Testament speaks of "what Moses *said,*" or of "that which was *spoken* of God,"

Luke rather refers to what was *written*. So also Luke omits the words given in Matthew x. 5, 6, which might have excited the prejudices of the Gentiles. We may therefore assume it as an unquestionable fact, that Luke wrote his Gospel chiefly for Gentile believers, as Origen long since remarked.

As to Theophilus, who appears to have been the immediate occasion of it, it is almost needless to inquire into his circumstances and country, because no certain information respecting him is available. Certainly he was not an imaginary person, as some have supposed. The epithet κράτιστος, prefixed to Θεόφιλος, has been thought to indicate rank or distinction, because it is assigned in the Acts of the Apostles to Felix and Festus, the Roman governors of Judea; and because in ancient inscriptions, it is given to high priests and priestesses; to such as had charge of the emperor's revenues, etc. In this way, it is concluded that he was a Christian man of consequence; one occupying an important and influential station; whence it was easy to convert him into a bishop, as was done by Isidore of Seville. But perhaps it does not necessarily follow from the adjective, that he was a person of eminence or authority. Rather does the word point to the affectionate regard which the evangelist entertained towards him. It expresses friendship in the writer, rather than power belonging to him to whom it is addressed. It was not unusual to employ it as nearly synonymous with φίλτατος, which is apparent from Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Luke omits it at the commencement of the Acts. The information of Theophilus, moreover, appears to have been exceedingly small, if we may properly judge of its character by the explanatory circumstances introduced into the Gospel;—too small for a person of eminence.

The Syrian lexicographer Bar Bahlul[p] and Jac. Hase[q] represent him as a distinguished Alexandrian; but the Alexandrian fathers make no mention of the circumstance. He has been assigned by others to Macedonia, Crete, Lycia, Athens—mere gratuitous conjectures. The opinion that he lived in Rome or Italy has been looked upon as most probable by Eichhorn, Hug, De Wette, and others. This is founded on Theophilus' supposed acquaintance with the Geography of Italy and Sicily, as is indicated by Acts

[p] In Castelli Lexicon Heptaglotton, vol. ii. p. 3859. [q] Bibl. Bremens, cl. iv. 3.

xxviii. 12-15, which presents a contrast to Luke i. 26; iv. 31; xxiv. 13; Acts i. 12; xvi. 12; xxvii. 8, 12, 16. Some uncertainty attaches to this mode of proof. Besides, explanatory geographical remarks are wanting in the record of apostolic travels through Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece (Acts xiii. 4-14; xiii. 51; xiv. 25; xv. 41; xvi. 11); while towards the latter part of the book the historian seems to hasten to the conclusion, and consequently studies brevity.

On the whole, there is so much uncertainty respecting Theophilus, that we are only on safe ground by pronouncing him a Gentile Christian living out of Palestine.

V. Characteristics.

Apart from the language, the Gospel of Luke has no characteristics which do not appear in a greater or less degree of prominence in Matthew and Mark. It presents, indeed, diversities from both; but these can scarcely be said to characterise it throughout. Its fundamental plan coincides with that of Matthew and Mark, more closely approximating to the latter.

In Luke we find circumstantiality, exactness, and graphic power. His circumstantiality and exactness are seen in the separation of particulars and incidents which Matthew has grouped together, and the placing of them in their proper relations. That he is also concise in his accounts is manifest; but conciseness cannot well be called a prominent feature, as it is in Mark.

As examples of his pictorial power we may select vii. 1-10; viii. 41-56. But Luke's graphic ability is scarcely equal to that of Mark, although it is greatly superior to Matthew's. In recording the discourses and parables of our Lord, his accounts are much briefer than Matthew's. Here his Gospel is far inferior to that of the apostle. He was more intent on the narration of facts and events, than of sermons and parables. In general, his narrative partakes of a loose and unconnected character. One event is related after another without any definite mark of time or exact formula of transition. Thus we meet with indefinite expressions like these:—(v. 1) *ἐγένετο δέ*; (v. 12) *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων*; (v. 17) *καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν*; (vi. 1) *ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ*; (vi. 6) *ἐγένετο δὲ*

καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ; (vii. 36-50) Ἤρώτα δέ τις αὐτὸν τῶν Φαρισαίων; (viii. 4-18) συνιόντος δὲ ὄχλου πολλοῦ; (viii. 22-25) καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμέρων; (ix. 1-6) συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα; (ix. 7-9) ἤκουσε δὲ Ἡρώδης; (ix. 18-27) καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον καταμόνας; (ix. 43-45) πάντων δὲ θαυμαζόντων ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, κ. τ. λ.; (ix. 46-50) εἰσῆλθε δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς; (x. 25-37) καὶ ἰδού, νομικός τις ἀνέστη; (xi. 1-13) καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν τόπῳ τινὶ, κ. τ. λ.; (xi. 14-28) καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον; (xi. 29-36) τῶν δὲ ὄχλων ἐπαθροιζομένων; (xiii. 10-17) ἦν διδάσκων ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν; (xiii. 18-21) ἔλεγε δὲ; (xiv. 1-24) καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκόν τινος, κ. τ. λ.; (xiv. 25-35) συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί; (xv. 1-32) ἦσαν δὲ ἐγγίζοντες αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ τελῶναι, κ. τ. λ.; (xvi. 1-31) ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ; (xvii. 1-10) εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς; (xvii. 20-37) ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων; (xviii. 1-14) ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς; (xx. 1) καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμέρων ἐκείνων. This feature, however, is by no means peculiar to Luke, though it is not what might be expected by those who maintain that he wrote in strictly chronological succession. The Gospel bears the impress of one who had searched and examined. It shews a man of education—a careful, critical writer—actuated, doubtless, by a conscientious love of truth, and influenced by the Spirit of God.

The peculiarities of *diction* have been ably set forth by Gersdorf and Credner, particularly the latter, whom we shall again follow.

The diction of Luke is *substantially* the same as that of the other evangelists, though it is considerably purer and less Hebraised. The proem is remarkably pure, presenting a considerable contrast not only to the first chapter in particular, which abounds with Hebraisms, but to the remainder of the Gospel. Hence it may be inferred, that the Gospel itself would have been written in more classical Greek, had the author been at perfect liberty to follow his own inclination or judgment. The freedom and individuality of his style was somewhat limited by adherence to oral tradition, or previously written documents, or both together; although the freedom and individuality of the writer are still marked with sufficient distinctness. When Wilke[r] attempts to

[r] Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik, p. 451, et seqq.

shew that Luke is characterised by a love for Hebraisms, which pervade the Gospel and Acts to a very great extent, and that the author used no written documents, he gives an exaggerated estimate of the evangelist's mode of writing. To any one not led away by preconceived notions, we think it must readily appear, that this Gospel, with the exception of the three hymns introduced at the commencement, is less Hebraised than any of the four. The following peculiarities, which stand out prominently in comparison with those of Matthew and Mark, are given by Credner. They are taken from the Acts as well as the Gospels, both being properly two parts of one work.

1. Ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ, וַיְהִי בְּ, with an infinitive following in designations of time, when a new state has taken place while another still continues, i. 8; ii. 6; iii. 21; v. 12; vi. 1; viii. 40; ix. 18, 29, 33, 51; x. 38; xi. 1, 27; xiv. 1; xvii. 11, 14; xviii. 35; xix. 15; xxiv. 4, 15, 30, 51. Acts ix. 37; xiv. 1; xix. 1; xxii. 17.

2. ἐγένετο ὡς in designations of time, when it is denoted that a certain state was just past when a new one took place, i. 23, 41, 44; ii. 15; iv. 25; xxii. 66. Acts x. 25. In the same manner ὡς without ἐγένετο, as ii. 39; v. 4; vii. 12; xi. 1; xv. 25; xix. 5, 29; xxiii. 26; xxiv. 32. Acts i. 10; v. 24; vii. 23; viii. 36; ix. 23; x. 7, 15, etc.

3. ἐγένετο and καὶ ἐγένετο, equivalent to the Hebrew וַיְהִי, in transition: καὶ ἐγένετο, i. 23, 41, 59, 65; ii. 15, 46; iv. 36; v. 12, 17; vi. 49; vii. 11; viii. 1, 22, 24; ix. 18, 29, 33; xiii. 19; xiv. 1; xvii. 11, 14; xix. 15, 29; xx. 1; xxiv. 4, 15, 30, 51. Acts ii. 2; xxi. 30. ἐγένετο δὲ, i. 8; ii. 1, 6; iii. 21; v. 1, 12; vi. 1, 6, 12; viii. 40; ix. 28, 37, 51, 57; x. 38; xi. 1, 14, 27; xvi. 22; xviii. 35; xxii. 22, 24, 44. Acts ii. 43; iv. 5; v. 7; viii. 1; ix. 19, 32, 37, 43; x. 10; xi. 26; xiv. 1; xvi. 16; xix. 1, 23; xxii. 17; xxiii. 9; xxviii. 8, 17.

4. ἀδικία, in the sense of wickedness, occurs only in Luke. This is to be traced to the Hebrew, where צְדָקָה is often applied to conduct, so that ἀδικία is used by way of antithesis to it, xiii. 27; xvi. 8, 9; xviii. 6. Acts i. 18; viii. 23.

5. ποιεῖν τινι or μετά τινος, עָשָׂה לְ or עָשָׂה עִם, i. 25, 49; viii. 39. Acts xiv. 27; xv. 4; xxi. 19.

6. A frequent use of compound phrases, in which καρδία appears after the manner of the Hebrew לֵב. Thus θέσθαι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις,

שׂוּם בְּלֵב, i. 66; xxi. 14. Acts v. 4, and *πρόσθεσις τῆς καρδίας*, Acts xi. 23. *διατηρεῖν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, ii. 51. *συμβάλλειν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, ii. 19. *διαλογίζεσθαι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, iii. 15; v. 22, and *διαλογισμὸς καρδίας*, ii. 35; ix. 47; xxiv. 38. *ἐπίνοια τ. κ.* Acts viii. 22. *ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὴν κ.* Acts vii. 23. *βαρυνέσθαι τὰς καρδιάς*, xxi. 34. *κατανυγῆναι τῇ κ.* Acts ii. 37. *διαπρίεσθαι ταῖς κ.* Acts vii. 54. *συνθρύπτειν τὴν κ.* Acts xxi. 13. *συντετριμμένος τὴν κ.* iv. 18.

7. The frequent use of *ὕψιστος*, עֶלְיוֹן, i. 32, 37, 76; ii. 14; vi. 35; viii. 28; xix. 38. Acts vii. 48; xvi. 17.

8. *οἶκος*, בַּיִת, in the sense of *household, family*, is peculiar to Luke's Gospel, though found in the Epistles, i. 27, 33, 69; ii. 4; x. 5; xi. 17; xix. 9. Acts. ii. 36; vii. 10, 42; x. 2; xi. 14; xvi. 15, 31; xviii. 8.

9. The sea of Gennesaret is called *λίμνη* by Luke alone, v. 1, 2; viii. 22, 23, 33. The other writers use *θαλάσση*, יָם.

10. *νομικοί*, where the other evangelists have *γραμματεῖς*, vii. 30; x. 25; xi. 45, 46, 52; xiv. 3. Matthew has it once.

11. *ἀνάγειν* or *ἀνάγεσθαι*, ii. 22; iv. 5; viii. 22; xxii. 66; Acts vii. 41; ix. 39; xii. 4; xiii. 13; xvi. 11, 34; xviii. 21; xx. 3, 13; xxi. 1, 2; xxvii. 2, 4, 12, 21; xxviii. 10, 11.

12. *ἐπιστάτης*, a word more intelligible to Greeks than *ῥαββί*, *διδάσκαλος*, etc., v. 5; viii. 24, 45; ix. 33, 49; xvii. 13. So also *ἀληθῶς* instead of *ἀμήν*, ix. 27, etc.

13. *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* and *τὰ νῦν*. The former, equivalent to the Hebrew מֵעַתָּה, occurs particularly in the Gospel, i. 48; v. 10; xii. 52; xxii. 69; Acts xviii. 6. The latter is good Greek, and occurs in Acts iv. 29; v. 38; xvii. 30; xx. 32; xxvii. 22.

14. The neuter of the participle with the article, in the singular or plural, is frequently employed instead of the simple substantive, as *τὸ εἰωθός* for *τὸ ἔθος*, iv. 16. Acts xvii. 2, or *τὸ εἰθισμένον*, ii. 27, for the same noun. *τὸ γεγονός*, viii. 34, 35, 56. Acts iv. 21; v. 7. *τὸ συμβεβηκός* xxiv. 14. Acts iii. 10. *τὰ κατεστραμμένα*, Acts xx. 30. *τὸ ὡρισμένον*, xxii. 22. *τὸ διατεταγμένον*, Acts xxiii. 31. *τὰ κεκριμένα*, Acts xvi. 4. *τὸ γεννωμένον*, i. 35.

15. The infinitive is frequently used with the article in a peculiar manner to indicate design; with the genitive of the article, i. 9, 57, 73; ii. 4, 21, 24; viii. 6; ix. 7; xi. 8; xii. 5, 42;

xxii. 6, 31; xxiv. 16, 25, 29, etc. Acts iii. 12; iv. 2; viii. 11; xiv. 9, 18; xviii. 10; xx. 3, 30; xxi. 12; xxiii. 15; xxvi. 18, etc.

16. The frequent use of δὲ καί by way of gradation or emphasis, ii. 4; iii. 9, 12; iv. 41; v. 10, 36; vi. 6; ix. 61; xi. 18; xii. 57; xiv. 12, 26; xvi. 1, 22; xviii. 1, 9; xix. 19; xx. 11, 12, 31; xxi. 2, 16; xxii. 24, 68; xxiii. 32, 35, 38, 55; xxiv. 37. Acts v. 16; ix. 24; xii. 25; xiii. 5; xix. 27; xxi. 16, etc.

17. In the same way Luke uses very frequently καὶ αὐτός or αὐτοί, i. 17, 22; ii. 28, 50; iii. 23; iv. 15; v. 1, 14, 17, 37; vi. 20; viii. 1, 22, 41; ix. 36, 51; x. 38; xi. 46; xiv. 1, 12; xv. 14; xvi. 24, 28; xvii. 11, 13, 16; xviii. 34; xix. 2; xx. 42; xxii. 23, 41; xxiii. 51; xxiv. 14, 15, 25, 28, 31, 35, 52. Acts ii. 22; viii. 13; xv. 32; xxi. 24; xxii. 20; xxiv. 15, 36; xxv. 22; xxvii. 36. The construction ἐγένετο δὲ, ἐν τῷ . . . . . καὶ αὐτός is particularly deserving of notice ii. 27 f.; v. 1; ix. 51; x. 38; xiv. 1; xvii. 11.

18. Position of the neuter article before interrogatory clauses, i. 62; vi. 11 in some MSS.; ix. 46; xix. 48; xxii. 2, 4, 23, 24. Acts iv. 21; xxii. 30.

19. Frequent use of the preposition σύν, i. 56; ii. 5, 13; v. 9, 19; vii. 6, 12; viii. 1, 38; ix. 32; xix. 23; xx. 1, etc. It is said to occur 24 times in the Gospel, and in the Acts 51 times. Matthew and Mark either abstain from the use of it, or have μετά instead. Compare Luke xx. 2 with Matth. xxi. 23; Mark xi. 27. Luke viii. 38 with Mark v. 18. Luke xxii. 14 with Matt. xxvi. 20; Mark xiv. 17. Luke xxii. 56 with Matt. xxvi. 69; Mark xiv. 66.

20. Jerusalem is oftenest written Ἱερουσαλήμ, ii. 25, 38, 41, 43, 45; iv. 9; v. 17; vi. 17 et passim. Acts i. 8, 12, 19; ii. 5, 14; iv. 5 et passim. More rarely does Luke employ Ἱεροσόλυμα ii. 22, 42; xviii. 31; xix. 28; xxiii. 7. Acts i. 4; viii. 1, 14; xi. 2, etc. Mark and John have Ἱεροσόλυμα alone; for in Mark xi. 1 the oldest authorities have this reading, and the only instance of Ἱερουσαλήμ in Matthew is in xxiii. 37.

21. The apostle Peter is called sometimes *Simon*, iv. 38; v. 3, 4, 5, 8, 10; vi. 14, 15; vii. 40, 43, 44; xxii. 31; xxiii. 26; xxiv. 34. Acts i. 13; viii. 9, 13, 18, 24; ix. 49 et passim. Sometimes *Peter*, v. 5; vi. 14; viii. 45, 51; ix. 20, 28, 32, 33; xii. 41, etc. Acts i. 13, 15; ii. 14, 37, 38, etc. John writes *Simon Peter;* Paul, *Peter* only.

22. *Until that* is expressed by Luke in his Gospel by ἕως ὅτου, xiii. 8; xv. 8; xxii. 16, 18. But in the Acts he uses only ἕως οὗ, like Matthew, xxi. 26; xxiii. 12, 14, 21; xxv. 21.

Luke uses ἅπας frequently, although it seldom appears in other parts of the New Testament, ii. 39; iii. 16, 21; iv. 6; v. 11, 26, 28, etc., etc. Acts ii. 1, 4, 14, 44; iv. 31, 32 et passim., no less than 35 times. In all other places of the New Testament together, it occurs only 9 times.

24. ἔλεος only in the neuter, i. 50, 54, 58, 72, 78; x. 37. Matthew uses it only in the masculine.

25. To the question, *How old?* Luke puts in the reply the verbs εἶναι and γίνεσθαι with the genitive, instead of the accusative, ii. 42; iii. 23; viii. 42. Acts iv. 22.

26. ἕως, *as far*, applied to place, ii. 15; iv. 29, 42; x. 15; xxiii. 5; xxiv. 50. Acts i. 8; ix. 38; xi. 19, 22; xiii. 47; xvii. 15; xxi. 5; xxiii. 23; xxvi. 11.

27. ἀτενίζειν followed by εἰς, or with the dative, iv. 20; xxii. 56. Acts i. 10; iii. 4, 12; vi. 15; vii. 55; x. 4; xi. 6; xiii. 9; xiv. 9; xxiii. 1. Paul is the only writer who uses the verb, and only twice in the second epistle to the Corinthians.

28. μὲν οὖν, generally without δέ following, iii. 18. (xi. 28.) Acts i. 6, 18; ii. 41; v. 41; viii. 4; ix. 31; xii. 5; xiii. 4; xiv. 3; xv. 3, 30; xvi. 5; xvii. 12, 17, 30; xviii. 14; xix. 32, 38; xxiii. 8, 18, 22, 31; xxv. 4; xxvi. 9; xxviii. 5.

29. ἰδοὺ γάρ, i. 44, 48; ii. 10; vi. 23; xvii. 21. Acts ix. 11. ἦ γάρ, xvi. 13. καὶ γάρ, vi. 32, 33, 34; vii. 8; xi. 4; xxii. 37, 59. Acts xix. 40. μὲν γάρ, Acts xiii. 36; xxiii. 8; xxv. 11; xxviii. 22. The three first expressions are not found elsewhere in the New Testament; but the last is often employed by Paul, though it is not in any of the gospels.

30. εἰ δὲ μήγε, v. 36, 37; x. 6; xiii. 9; xiv. 32. Mark and John have only εἰ δὲ μή.

31. The frequent use of καθώς and ὡσεί. — καθώς, i. 2, 55, 70; ii. 20, 23; v. 14; vi. 31, 36; xi. 1, etc. Acts ii. 4, 22; vii. 17, 42, 44, et passim. ὡσεί, i. 56; iii. 22, 23; ix. 14, 28; xxii. 41, 44; xxiii. 44; xxiv. 11. Acts ii. 3, 41; iv. 4, etc., etc.

32. καθότι, i. 7; xix. 9. Acts ii. 24, 45; iv. 35. καθόλου, Acts iv. 18. καθεξῆς, i. 3; viii. 1. Acts iii. 24; xi. 4; xviii. 23.

These three expressions do not appear elsewhere in the New Testament. *Καθ' ἡμέραν*, xi. 3; xvi. 19; xix. 47; xxii. 53. Acts ii. 46, 47; iii. 2; xvi. 5; xvii. 11; xix. 9. *καθημερινός*, Acts vi. 1.

33. *ἐν τάχει*, xviii. 8. Acts xii. 7; xxii. 18; xxv. 4. *ἐν ὀλίγῳ*, Acts xxvi. 28, 29.

34. *ὀπτασία* and *ὄπτομαι*, of the appearances of angels, i. 11, 22; xxii. 43; xxiv. 23. Acts xvi. 9.

35. *εἰπεῖν* and *λαλεῖν*, though sometimes construed with the dative of the person addressed, are usually found in connexion with *πρός* and the accusative.—*εἰπεῖν πρός τινα*, i. 13, 18, 28, 34, 61; ii. 15, 34, 49; iii. 12, 13, 14; iv. 23, 43; v. 4, 10, 22, 31, 34; vi. 9 et passim. Acts 1, 7; ii. 37; iii. 22; iv. 19; v. 9, 35 et passim. *λαλεῖν πρός τινα*, i. 19, 55; ii. 18, 20; xii. 3; xxiv. 44. Acts iii. 22; iv. 1; viii. 26; xi. 14, 20; xxi. 39; xxvi. 26. *εἰπεῖν* with *πρός* is sometimes found in John, but nowhere else in the New Testament; and *λαλεῖν πρός* occurs in 1 Cor. xiv. 6. Hebrews v. 5; xi. 18.

36. In a similar manner, Luke uses *πρός* in construction with other verbs, so as to evince a partiality for this preposition, *ἀποκρίνεσθαι πρός*, iv. 4; vi. 3; xiv. 5. Acts iii. 12; xxv. 16. *ἀπαγγέλλειν πρός*, Acts xvi. 36. *διαλέγεσθαι πρός*, Acts xviii. 16. *συζητεῖν πρός* xxii. 23. Acts ix. 29. So also *παραγίνεσθαι πρός*, vii. 4, 20; viii. 19. Acts xx. 18. *ἀντιβάλλειν πρός*, xxiv. 17. *ποιεῖν πρός*, xii. 47, etc.

37. Luke evinces a predilection for verbs compounded with prepositions, especially with *διά* and *ἐπί*, as *διαγινώσκω*, *διαγογγίζω*, *διαλογίζομαι*, *διαμαρτύρομαι*, *διαμερίζω*, *διανοίγω*, *διαπορεύομαι*, *διασώζω*, *διατάσσω*, *διατρίβω*, *διαχειρίζομαι*, *διέρχομαι*, *ἐπιλαμβάνομαι*, *ἐπαισχύνομαι*, *ἐπιβιβάζω*, *ἐπιστρέφω*, *ἐπιπίπτω*, *ἐπιφωνέω*, etc. Also for verbs compounded with two prepositions, *διακατελέγχομαι*, *ἐπαναπαύομαι*, *ἐξαποστέλλομαι*, *ἐπανέρχομαι*, *ἐπανάγω*, etc.

38. He uses the participle very frequently to add vividness to the description, *ἀναστάς*, i. 39; iv. 29, 38, 39; v. 25, 28; vi. 8; xi. 7, 8; xv. 18, 20; xvii. 19; xxii. 45, 46; xxiii. 1; xxiv. 12, 33; Acts i. 15; iii. 26; v. 6, 17, 34; viii. 27; ix. 11, 18, 39; x. 13, 20, etc. *ἐγερθείς*, viii. 24; xi. 8. *στραφείς*, vii. 9, 44; ix. 55; x. 23;

xiv. 25; xxi. 61; xxiii. 28. *ἐπιστρέψας*, Acts ix. 40; xv. 36; xvi. 18. *σταθείς*, xviii. 11, 40; xix. 8; Acts ii. 14; v. 20; xi. 13; xvii. 22; xxv. 18; xxvii. 21. *ἐπιστάς*, ii. 38; iv. 39; x. 40. Acts vi. 12; xxii. 13, 20. *ἑστώς*, Acts v. 25; xvi. 9. *καθίσας*, v. 3; xiv. 28, 31.; xvi. 6; Acts xii. 21; xvi. 13; xxv. 6, 17. *πεσών*, v. 12; Acts v. 5; ix. 4; x. 25. *θεὶς τὰ γόνατα*, xxii. 41; Acts vii. 60; ix. 40; xx. 36; xxi. 5; Mark has *τιθεὶς τὰ γόν.* Paul *κάμπτειν γόνυ.*

39. Instead of a finite verb, *ἦν* or *ἦσαν*, less frequently *ἔσομαι* are used with the participle, i. 7, 10, 21, 22; ii. 26, 51; iv. 16, 17, 20, 30, 31, 38, 44; v. 1, 17 (three times), 18, 29; vi. 2; viii. 40; ix. 32, 45, 53; xi. 14; xiii. 10, 11; xiv. 1; xv. 1, 24; xix. 47; xxiii. 8, 51; xxiv. 13, 32; Acts i. 10, 13, 14, 17; ii. 2, 42; iii. 10; iv. 31; viii. 1, 13, 28; ix. 9, 28, 33; x. 24; xii. 5, 6, 12, 20; xiii. 48; xiv. 7, 12, 26; xvi. 9, 12; xviii. 7, 25; xix. 14, 32; xx. 8, 13; xxi. 3, 9, 29; xxii. 29; xxiii. 13. With *ἔσομαι*, i. 20; v. 10; vi. 40; xii. 52; xvii. 35; xxi. 17, 24.

40. *πορεύεσθαι*, or *ἐκπορεύεσθαι*, is frequently employed for the purpose of making a thing more vivid, i. 6, 39; ii. 3, 41; iv. 30, 42; v. 24, etc. *πορεύεσθαι*, so used, is found in the Gospel forty-nine times, in the Acts thirty-eight times. *ἐκπορεύεσθαι*, iii. 7; iv. 22, 37; Acts ix. 28; xxv. 4.

41. *ὀνόματι*, *by the name of, named*, i. 5; v. 27; x. 38; xvi. 20; xxiii. 50; Acts v. 1, 34; viii. 9; ix. 10, 11, 12, 33, 36; x. 1; xi. 28; xii. 13; xvi. 1, 14; xvii. 34; xviii. 2, 7, 24; xix. 24; xx. 9; xxi. 10; xxvii. 1; xxviii. 7. *ὀνόματι* occurs but once in Matt. xxvii. 32. Instead of it he generally has *ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, and John *ὄνομα αὐτῷ*. Luke, too, uses both in his Gospel, but not often.

42. *καλούμενος*, *ἐπικαλούμενος*, *named, surnamed*, i. 36; vi. 15; vii. 11; viii. 2; ix. 10; x. 39; xix. 29; xxi. 37; xxiii. 33; Acts i. 12, 23; v. 11; vii. 58; ix. 11; x. 1; xiii. 1; xv. 37; xxvii. 8; xiv. 16. *ἐπικαλ.* xxii. 3; Acts vii. 59; ix. 14, 21; x. 18; xi. 13; xii. 12. *καλεῖσθαι* and *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι* are favourite terms of the evangelist, the former in the Gospel, the latter in the Acts. So also *συγκαλεῖν*, which is found but once in Mark.

43. For the participle perfect of *ἵστημι* and its compounds,

Luke always uses the shorter form ἑστώς, not ἑστηκώς. ἑστώς, i. 11; v. 1, 2; ix. 27; xviii. 13; Acts iv. 14; v. 23, 25; vii. 55, 56; xxi. 40; xxii. 25; xxiv. 21. συνεστώς, ix. 32. ἐφεστώς, Acts xxii. 20; xxviii. 2. παρεστώς, xix. 24; Acts xxiii. 2, 4.

44. χάρις, i. 30; ii. 40, 52; iv. 22; vi. 32, 33, 34; xvii. 9; Acts ii. 47; iv. 33; vi. 8; vii. 10, 46; xi. 23; xiii. 43; xiv. 3, 26; xv. 11, 40; xviii. 27; xx. 24, 32; xxiv. 27; xxv. 3, 9. In Matthew and Mark the word is not found; and it appears only three times in John's Gospel.

45. σωτήρ, σωτηρία, σωτήριον, i. 47, 69, 71, 77; ii. 11, 30; iii. 6; xix. 9; Acts iv. 12; v. 31; vii. 25; xiii. 23, 26, 47; xvi. 7; xxvii. 34; xxviii. 28. σωτήρ and σωτηρία each occur once in John's Gospel; but with this exception, the terms are not elsewhere found in the Gospels.

46. εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, i. 19; ii. 10; iii. 18; iv. 18, 43; vii. 22; viii. 1; ix. 6; xvi. 16; xx. 1. Acts v. 42; viii. 4, etc. etc. The verb occurs once in Matthew, but never in the Gospels of Mark and John.

47. μένειν, *to dwell*, viii. 24; ix. 4, x. 7; xix. 5; xxiv. 29. Acts ix. 43; xxviii. 16, 30.

48. ὑποστρέφειν, *to return*, never ἀναχωρεῖν, i. 56; ii. 39, 43, 45; iv. 1, 14; vii. 10; viii. 37, 39, 40; ix. 10; x. 17; xi. 24; xvii. 15, 18; xix. 12; xxiii. 48, 56; xxiv. 9, 33, 52. Acts i. 12; viii. 25, 28; xii. 25; xiii. 13, 34; xiv. 21; xx. 3; xxi. 6; xxii. 17; xxiii. 32. The word never occurs in Matthew; and in Mark we find it but once.

49. ἐξαποστέλλειν, especially with κενόν, i. 53; xx. 10, 11. Acts vii. 12; ix. 30; xi. 22; xii. 11; xvii. 14; xxii. 21.

50. ὑπάρχειν, vii. 25; viii. 41; ix. 48; xi. 13: xvi. 14, 23; xxiii. 50. Acts ii. 30; iii. 2, 6; iv. 34, 37; v. 4, etc. etc. No other evangelist has the word.

51. αὐξάνειν, *to grow*, i. 80; ii. 40. Acts vi. 7; vii. 17; xii. 24; xix. 20.

52. The beginnings of extraordinary states of mind in individuals are expressed by Luke, by the verb ἐπιπίπτειν, i. 12. Acts viii. 16; x. 10, 44; xi. 15; xiii. 11; xix. 17. The states themselves are commonly denoted by ἐξίστασθαι, ii. 47; viii. 56; xxiv. 22. Acts ii. 7, 12; viii. 9, 13; ix. 21; xii. 16.

53. *ἐφιστάναι*, ii. 9, 38; iv. 39; x. 40; xx. 1; xxi. 34; xxiv. 4. Acts iv. 1; vi. 12; x. 17; xi. 11; xii. 7; xvii. 5; xxii. 13, 20; xxiii. 11, 27; xxviii. 2. No other evangelist uses the word; and Paul has it only three times.

54. Luke loves to prefix the adjective *μέγας* to powerful affections or their manifestations. *φόβος μέγας*, ii. 9; viii. 37. Acts v. 5, 11. *χαρὰ μεγάλη*, ii. 10; xxiv. 52. Acts viii. 8; xv. 3. *φωνὴ μεγάλη*, i. 42; iv. 33; viii. 28; xvii. 15; xix. 34; xxiii. 23, 46. Acts vii. 57, 60; viii. 7; xiv. 10; xvi. 28; xxvi. 24. *κραυγὴ μεγάλη*, Acts xxiii. 9, etc.

55. *διέρχεσθαι*, ii. 15, 35, etc. It occurs eleven times in the Gospel, and twenty-one times in the Acts; while in Matthew, Mark, and John, it is found but twice in each.

56. *ἱκανός* in the signification of *numerous, many*, vii. 11, 12; viii. 27, 32; xx. 9; xxiii. 8, 9. Acts v. 37; viii. 11; ix. 23, 43; xi. 24, 26; xii. 12; xiv. 3, 21; xviii. 18; xix. 19, 26; xx. 8, 37; xxii. 6; xxvii. 7, 9.

57. *τὸ πλῆθος*, *ἅπᾶν τὸ πλῆθος*, *πολὺ πλῆθος*, i. 10; ii. 13; v. 6; vi. 17; viii. 37; xix. 37; xxiii. 1, 27. Acts ii. 6; iv. 32; v. 14, 16; vi. 2, 5; xiv. 1, 4; xv. 12, 30; xvii. 4; xix. 9; xxi. 22, 36; xxiii. 7; xxv. 24; xxviii. 3.

58. Luke in general appears to be fond of words and modes of expression indicative of fulness. In this respect he resembles Paul. *πλήρης*, with the exception of v. 12, is used metaphorically, iv. 1; v. 12. Acts vi. 3, 5, 8; vii. 55; ix. 36; xi. 24; xiii. 10; xix. 28. *πληρόω*, i. 20; ii. 40; iii. 5; iv. 21; vii. 1; ix. 31; xxi. 22, 24; xxii. 16; xxiv. 44. Acts i. 16; ii. 2, 28; iii. 18; v. 3, 28, etc. *πλήθω* and *πληθύνω* for the most part metaphorically, i. 15, 23, 41, 57, 67; ii. 6, 21, 22; iv. 28; v. 7, 26; vi. 1, 7, 11; vii. 17; ix. 31; xii. 24. Acts ii. 4; iii. 10; iv. 8, 31; v. 17; ix. 17; xiii. 9, 45; xix. 29. *ἐμπλήθω*, i. 53; vi. 25. Acts xiv. 17. *συμπληρόω*, viii. 23; ix. 51. Acts ii. 1. *πληροφορέω*, i. 1.

59. *κατασείειν τῇ χειρί*, Acts xii. 17; xiii. 16; xix. 33; xxi. 40. *προχειρίζεσθαι*, iii. 20; xxii. 14; xxvi. 16. *συγχεῖν*, *συγχύνειν*, Acts ii. 6; ix. 22; xix. 32; xxi. 27, 31. *ἀποφθέγγεσθαι*, ii. 4, 14; xxvi. 25. *ἐπιχειρεῖν*, i. 1. Acts ix. 29; xix. 13. *διαπορεῖν*, ix. 7; xxiv. 4. Acts ii. 12; v. 24; x. 17. *ὀδυνᾶσθαι*, ii. 48; xvi. 24, 25. Acts xx. 38. *ὁμιλεῖν*, xxiv. 14, 15. Acts xx. 11; xxiv. 26.

συμβάλλειν, ii. 19; xiv. 31. Acts iv. 15; xvii. 18; xviii. 27; xx. 14. ὑπολαμβάνειν, vii. 34; x. 30. Acts i. 9; ii. 15. All these are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα.

60. πείθειν, πείθεσθαι, xi. 22; xvi. 31; xviii. 9; xx. 6. Acts v. 36, 37, 40; xii. 20; xiii. 43; xiv. 19; xvii. 4; xviii. 4; xix. 8, 26, 29; xxi. 14; xxiii. 21: xxvi. 26, 28; xxvii. 11; xxviii. 23, 24.

61. ὁμοθυμαδόν, Acts i. 14; ii. 1, 46; iv. 24; v. 12; vii. 57; viii. 6; xii. 20; xv. 25; xviii. 12; xix. 24.

62. The frequent use of ἀνήρ in addresses and before substantives. Only in the Acts i. 11, 16; ii. 14, 22, 29, 37; iii. 2, 12, 14; v. 35; vii. 2, 26; viii. 27; x. 28; xi. 20; xiii. 15, 16, 26, 38; xiv. 15; xv. 7; xvii. 22; xix. 25, 35; xxi. 28; xxii. 1, 3; xxiii. 1, 6; xxvii. 10, 21, 25; xxviii. 17.

63. ἑξῆς vii. 11; ix. 37. Acts xxi. 1; xxv. 17; xxvii. 18. ἄφνω, Acts ii. 2; xvi. 26; xxviii. 6. ἐξαίφνης, ii. 13; ix. 39. Acts ix. 3; xxii. 6. ἐξαυτῆς, Acts x. 33; xi. 11; xxi. 32; xxiii. 30. διαπαντός, xxiv. 53. Acts ii. 25; x. 2; xxiv. 16. παραχρῆμα, i. 64; iv. 39; v. 25; viii. 44, 47, 55; xiii. 13; xviii. 43; xix. 11; xxii. 60. Acts iii. 7; v. 10; ix. 18; xii. 23; xiii. 11; xvi. 26, 33. Only twice in Matthew.

64. εὐλαβής, ii. 25. Acts ii. 5; viii. 2; xxii. 12.

65. παῖς θεοῦ, i. 54, 69. Acts iii. 13, 26; iv. 25, 27, 30.

On the whole, Luke's language approaches more nearly to classical Greek than that of any other evangelist. It is purer and more correct than that of the other apostles. The number of terms and modes of expression peculiar to himself is great. Awkward and unusual constructions, such as are found in Matthew and Mark, are generally avoided. Hence *the comparative* ease and elegance of the diction. Thus, instead of βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς (Mark xii. 38), Luke inserts φιλούντων before ἀσπασμούς, which removes the harshness. Again, ἄνθρωπός ειμι ἐξουσίαν, ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας (Matthew viii. 9), Luke has τασσόμενος after ἐξουσίαν, thus obviating the harshness and obscurity. Compare also the words of Matthew, πάντες γὰρ ἔχουσι τὸν Ἰωάννην ὡς προφήτην (xxi. 36), which are bad Greek, with those of Luke, ὁ λαὸς . . . . πεπεισμένος ἐστιν Ἰωάννην προφήτην

εἶναι; the οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ φοροῦντες of the former, with the οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες of the latter.

There is a perceptible difference in the style of the Gospel and of the Acts; the advantage being on the side of the latter. Here we find more ease and correctness, such as would naturally be acquired by practice. The Gospel was written first, hence it is less perfect as to composition. The Acts exhibit the mode of an author accustomed to write. It was formerly remarked, that the preface of the Gospel is more classical in its style than the work itself to which it is prefixed. A similar difference, less perceptible perhaps, but palpable notwithstanding, exists between the former and latter parts of the Acts,—those relating to transactions of which he was not an eye-witness, and those of which he was an eye-witness, in company with Paul; the style of the latter being more classical than that of the former. Doubtless the difference must be accounted for in the same manner; viz., the use of written documents or verbal traditions in the one, and not in the other.

VI. Time and Place.

It is impossible to ascertain the time and place at which the Gospel was written. The New Testament furnishes nothing towards a satisfactory determination of them. Hence an abundance of conjectures has sprung up. No less than nine places have been mentioned where the document is supposed to have been composed; viz., Alexandria in Egypt, Alexandria in Troas, Achaia, particularly Bœotia, Macedonia, Bithynia, Antioch, Rome, Thebes in Egypt, and Caesarea. It is not at all probable that Luke was at Alexandria in Egypt, fifteen years after the ascension of Christ, at which time some think the Gospel was written. We know that this period is specified in the subscriptions of several MSS., which coincide with A. D. 48; but no historical value can attach to such notices. Nor is it probable that he wrote in Egypt after Paul's martyrdom at Rome, or after he had left Paul at Rome, in the captivity mentioned in the Acts. None of the Alexandrian fathers hint at Luke's presence in Egypt. According to the subscription of Erpen's Arabic version, Luke wrote it in a town of Macedonia, twenty-two years after the ascension, in the fourteenth of Claudius' reign. This view is apparently favoured by Clement,

though opposed to the common tradition respecting the order in which the Gospels appeared, for it makes Luke prior to Mark. It may be questioned whether he had sufficient leisure to investigate the entire subject from the very beginning, and to write the history, before his residence at Rome with the apostle, during the two years' imprisonment. Bertholdt and Schott have fixed upon Caesarea; but yet Luke may have been employed by Paul, while the latter was a prisoner there, on various errands to the churches.

It seems to us most probable on the whole, that the Gospel was written at Rome during the time of Paul's imprisonment; for it is evident that Italy was the country to which Theophilus and the first readers of it belonged; that the author had more leisure there than elsewhere; and that it preceded the composition of the Acts at the same place about the commencement of the year 63, according to the chronology of Anger[s] and Wieseler. Hence the Gospel may be assigned to 61, as nearly as possible, at which time Peter had not arrived at Rome. It is true that Rome is mentioned by no ancient writer as the birth-place of the document; but the probable circumstances of the case outweigh the want of all uncertain notices. Greece is mentioned by several of the fathers as the place where it originated; and therefore Feilmoser infers that it was *completed* at least after Luke had left Rome. But this view does not harmonise with its priority to the Acts of the Apostles, and the abrupt termination of that book which points to Rome as its birth-place.

Kaiser[t], De Wette, and Credner, adopt the singular notion that it was written after the destruction of Jerusalem. The reasons assigned by De Wette are the existence of many preparatory apocryphal Gospels; an evangelical tradition, confused in part; a persecution of the Christians, which had already taken place (xxi. 12, comp. Matt. xxiv. 8; Luke xii. 32; xviii. 1, etc.); the destruction of Jerusalem (xxi. 20-24, comp. Matt. xxiv. 15, etc.); and the hope of Christ's coming, separated from the final catastrophe of the city (xxi. 25, comp. Matt. xxiv. 29).

The denial of prophecy, or at least of distinct details in pro-

[s] De Temporum in Actis Apostolorum Ratione, etc. 1833. 8vo.
[t] Biblische Theologie, Theil i. p. 247, et seqq.

phetic discourse, lies at the foundation of this opinion; so that in order to meet it fully, it would be necessary to prove the possibility and probability of prophecy, as well as the reasonableness of believing that the sacred writers, for the accomplishment of important ends under the divine economy, were so directed as to describe future events before they took place, with perfect accuracy of detail.

The passage xxi. 12 speaks of a time then future. Persecution was about to set in, but had not yet done so. The future tense is employed. A like remark applies to xxi. 20-24. To us the expectation of Christ's coming does not appear separated from the destruction of Jerusalem, but rather connected with it, according to the twenty-seventh verse. The right decision, however, of this point depends on the interpretation of the entire chapter compared with the parallel chapter in Matthew. At the destruction of Jerusalem, Christ was said to come; and, from the twenty-fifth and following verses, the future coming of the Lord to judgment is not so widely disconnected from the events described in the verses preceding the twenty-fifth, as that no allusion is made in the one portion to the other. It is very difficult to prove that the twenty-fifth verse begins *a new subject*. In our view, the same subject is continued; there being perhaps a gradual transition from Christ's coming to destroy Jerusalem, to the more awful coming which it faintly adumbrated. Yet the transition is indistinct, both events being in some degree commingled.

The external testimony of Irenaeus, to which Credner appeals, determines nothing either for or against so late a date. Nor has the existence of the apocryphal Gospels any important bearing on the point.

We appeal therefore with confidence to the twenty-first chapter, to prove that Luke wrote *before* the destruction of Jerusalem, since it speaks of things future not of past events. The Saviour there warns his disciples of impending dangers, but does not speak to them of perils from which they had just escaped. He prepares them for troublous times.

Compared with the times when Matthew and Mark wrote, the Gospel of Luke is supposed by some to have been written before either of them. Others again believe, that his Gospel appeared after

Matthew, but before Mark; while others place it after both. The first of these three hypotheses must be rejected. To decide between the remaining two is no easy task. We believe that Luke wrote prior to Mark.

VII. Authenticity.

The authenticity of this Gospel is so well attested, that many sceptical authors have admitted it. Luke, the writer of the Acts of the Apostles, expressly refers in that work to the Gospel, and announces himself as the author of *the former treatise.* Yet the authenticity is subverted by such as bring down the composition of the Gospel to the second century. Hence, by proving that it existed at an earlier period—that it was quoted or alluded to as the veritable production of Luke, Paul's companion, and as a sacred document of authority—the authenticity is firmly settled.

The oldest testimony some have found in the New Testament itself. In 1 Timothy v. 18, we read: "For *the Scripture saith,* Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, *The labourer is worthy of his reward.*" Here the formula ἡ γραφὴ λέγει marks the words as a quotation, the conjunction καὶ at the same time specifying its twofold composition. But the latter clause occurs no where else than in Luke x. 7, where the very same words are found. Theodoret and Theophylact thought they perceived the source of the citation, which Baur readily admits. This explanation, however, can scarcely be admitted. Supposing Luke to have written his Gospel before Paul addressed his first epistle to Timothy, the apostle would most probably have said λέγει ὁ κύριος, not λέγει ἡ γραφή.

Marcion's testimony is both ancient and important. *His* Gospel was none other than that of Luke abridged and mutilated in various ways. Formerly, indeed, it was believed to be a peculiar document, independent of Luke's Gospel; but later researches have shewn the opposite, particularly those of Hahn[u], and Olshausen[x]. As this is now conceded by most writers, except those of the Tübingen school,—as it is assented to by such critics as Hug,

[u] Die Echtheit der vier kanon. Evangelien, p. 106, et seqq.

[x] Das Evangelium Marcions in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt. Königsberg, 1823. 8vo.

Neander, Credner, De Wette, and Gieseler, the arguments by which it is established need not be repeated. We cannot imagine that the laboured attempt of Ritschl[y] to prove that Luke, or rather the writer of the third Gospel, drew his materials chiefly from Marcion's Gospel will ever commend itself to the calm inquirer; or that the process by which he seeks to arrive at his conclusion will be regarded in any other light than as a piece of perverse, illogical, inconsequential reasoning. The work deserves no formal refutation; and even if it did, we could not afford space in our present inquiries to dissect it thoroughly. We must content ourselves with pronouncing it a failure. Most lamentable is it to see so much learning and labour expended so fruitlessly, or rather so injuriously to the interests of truth. A similar opinion must be pronounced on Baur's essay[z], advocating the same views, which, with all its acuteness, is thoroughly pervaded by a negative criticism that disregards and despises historic testimony. What is *objective* speedily gives way to the *subjective*. The reason why Marcion adopted the Gospel of Luke only, was its exhibition of the Pauline type of doctrine, which harmonised best with his anti-Jewish gnosis.

Even Cerdo, Marcion's teacher, was acquainted with our Gospel, if we may rely on the testimony of an anonymous writer in the appendix to Tertullian's treatise, *De praescript. adversus haeres.*, where it is written: "(Cerdon) solum evangelium Lucae, nec tamen totum recipit." It must be admitted, however, that this testimony appears to be incorrect. Theodoret affirms, that Cerdon had more Gospels than one[a].

Credner endeavours to shew, that Papias's language, as quoted by Eusebius in the third book of his ecclesiastical history (iii. 39.), has an obvious reference to Luke's preface; so that we have, in the bishop of Hierapolis, the oldest uninspired witness in favour of the Gospel's existence before his time. That the document had been written before the time of Papias we have not a doubt. He must have known it equally with the compositions of Matthew and Mark. But the words preserved by Eusebius scarcely prove the

[y] Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium Lucas. Tübingen. 1846. 8vo.

[z] Kritische Untersuchungen, etc. pp. 397-427.

[a] Haeret. fab. i. 24.

position built upon them by Credner. Hence we do not adduce Papias as an evidence. The Gospel was *certainly* made use of by Justin Martyr. Thus the announcement of the angel to Mary, as given in Luke i. 30, 31; part of Mary's words in i. 38; the description of Joseph's journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem in consequence of the taxing in the time of Cyrenius, in ii. 1, etc.; the want of accommodation in the inn, and the laying of the child in a manger, ii. 6, etc.; the fact that Jesus was thirty years of age at his baptism, stated in iii. 23; the circumstances recorded in xxii. 19, 20, 42-44; xxiii. 7, 8, 46; xxiv. 1; these and other passages that might be adduced, are quoted more or less freely in Justin's writings.

Celsus had Luke's Gospel in his hands, attacking it equally with the others, as a book of the Christians. He alludes to the discrepancies between the evangelists regarding the angels at the sepulchre of Jesus, Matthew and Mark mentioning but one angel, while Luke and John speak of two. A remark which he makes about Mary, viz. that the wife of the carpenter would not have been ignorant of her descent from Adam[b] also proves, that Celsus knew Luke's Gospel, in which the genealogy is carried up to Adam.

Tatian's harmony was founded on the four Gospels, which is an evidence for its author's acquaintance with that of Luke. Valentinus and his disciples also made use of the Gospel by Luke; for we learn from Irenaeus that they regarded Simeon as a type of the *Demiurge;* while, by Anna the Prophetess, who lived seven years with a husband and passed the rest of her life in widowhood, they understood *Achamoth.* In proof of the number twelve, which they applied to the Æons, they appealed to the age of Jesus when he disputed with the doctors in the temple. The woman who had lost the piece of money and swept the house for the purpose of finding it, represented, according to this sect, the higher *Sophia*[c].

The Marcosians, in order to prove that the true God was unknown before Christ, referred in particular to Luke ii. 49, and xix. 42. They made a distinction between *psychical* and *pneumatic* baptism, which they endeavoured to support by Luke xii. 50[d].

[b] Origen contra Cels. ii. 32.

[c] Irenaeus, lib. i. c. 3, 8.

[d] Ibid. lib. i. c. 20, 21.

In the extracts from Theodotus's writings usually appended to the works of Clemens Alexandrinus, there are various references to passages in Luke's Gospel. Thus he mentions the person who, having gone abroad, had devoured his substance, and for whom his father killed the fatted calf. The story of the rich man and Lazarus is also noticed [e].

In the fragments of Heracleon still preserved, there is evidence of the writer's acquaintance with Luke's Gospel. It is not improbable indeed that he wrote a commentary on it, since his explanations of iii. 17 and xii. 8 are given.

In the epistle of the Christians of Vienne and Lyons, under Marcus Aurelius, Vettius Epagathus, one of the martyrs, is compared to Zacharias described in Luke i. 6, 67 [f].

After these testimonies, it is needless to quote the express words of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement, Origen, Epiphanius, Jerome and other fathers, since it is now generally admitted, that the Gospel was written by the companion of Paul, who wrote the Acts of the Apostles. But although the authenticity of Luke's Gospel is so commonly allowed, weighty objections have been brought against it by several writers. It has been censured and criticised with great severity. Thus Credner, who places it on a level with the work of Papias of which Eusebius has given several extracts, says, that the writer was not competent for the critical work which he undertook; that his chronology is lame and erroneous, especially in ii. 1, 2, and iii. 23, the latter passage in its vagueness being irreconcilable with the former in its attempted precision. The same critic complains, that the first two chapters contain myths and traditional sayings, which have been excluded by the author of Mark's Gospel from his document, which were unknown to John, and are at variance with the first two chapters of Matthew's Gospel. Such accusations, if true, would vitiate the Gospel before us, and open the way to an arbitrary criticism proceeding from subjective caprice, which might not even stop at the point where Credner halts, but sweep away far more than the miraculous facts.

Let us notice the points of offence in Luke's Gospel.

The first passage to which exception is made is Luke ii. 1, 2:

[e] Epitomai, c. 9, 14, 60, 73.

[f] Ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 1.

"And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed. And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria. And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city," etc.

Here four points are chiefly urged by Strauss, B. Bauer, and De Wette.

1. The *ἀπογραφή* in question was a general census commanded by Augustus, embracing the entire Roman empire, whereas no contemporary historian mentions such a census. The writers of that period simply record separate provincial valuations instituted at different times.

2. The Roman census here spoken of must have been held either under Herod the Great himself, or early in the administration of Archelaus. But this is extremely improbable; for in countries not yet reduced to the form of a Roman province, but governed by *reges socii*, these princes themselves collected the taxes. The same usage prevailed in Judea before the deposition of Archelaus.

3. The census of Quirinus did not take place either in the time of Herod, or in the first years of Archelaus' reign, but about ten years after the birth of Jesus. This is apparent from Josephus. Hence the census of which Luke speaks could not have happened at the period when Jesus was born, according to the representations of Matthew and Luke.

4. A Roman census after Archelaus' banishment could not possibly require the parents of Jesus to travel from Nazareth in Galilee to Bethlehem in Judea. Least of all was the personal appearance of *females* necessary.

The conclusion drawn from the entire passage is, that Luke has erroneously transferred the census of Quirinus to an earlier time than the true one, and thus contradicted authentic history.

1. It is here assumed, that *πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη* denotes *the then known world*, or *the Roman empire*, not the land of Judea merely. This assumption seems to be perfectly correct, notwithstanding the attempts of Paulus, Kuinoel, Olshausen, and others, to restrict the phrase to the territory of Judea. Usage warrants the extended sense, and discountenances the limited. The

adjective πᾶς prefixed to οἰκουμένη, ought not to have been disregarded.

The meaning of the term ἀπογραφή has been variously assigned. Strauss defines it an enrolment of names and valuation of property, with the view of taxation. In this way it is made to include both the registration of names and the calculation of property. But the word *by itself* means no more than an enrolment *per capita*, or registration of names. It does not *properly* include valuation of property. It may indeed contain a reference to property as well as a list of names, but this is not the primary and strict idea implied in the word. A census having for its object the valuation of property was called ἀποτίμησις, a term applied by Josephus to the census of Quirinus. And although Luke in the Acts of the Apostles (v. 37) uses ἀπογραφή in reference to the census of Quirinus, yet we believe that in the present case it is not so employed, but rather in its proper and strict meaning of enrolment of names, exclusive of valuation of property.

But notwithstanding the use of ἀπογραφή in this its appropriate meaning, it may be doubted whether the verb ἀπογράφομαι, in the first verse, should be so understood. It occurs there in describing the purport of a decree issuing from a Roman emperor; and we know that a proper Roman census necessarily included a calculation of property. When Augustus issued the δόγμα that πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀπογράφεσθαι, it is likely he meant an enrolment *per capita*, and also a valuation of property. Such was probably the import of the decree; and in the Roman provinces a census of this kind was taken, in pursuance of the imperial mandate. But circumstances connected with a part of the *orbis Romanus* embraced in the decree, may have determined Augustus to proceed no farther in the first instance than a registration of names. Political or prudential considerations may have dictated this step in relation to Palestine at the peculiar time when the decree was promulgated. If the noun ἀπογραφή be employed in a more limited sense than the verb ἀπογράφομαι in the first verse might lead the reader to suppose, then there is nothing incongruous in the limited use of the same verb ἀπογράφομαι in the third verse, because it occurs there in a description of the actual

carrying out of the decree in a particular part of the Roman empire, and must be taken in a sense corresponding to that of ἀπογραφή in the second verse. The two words which Luke employs, in speaking of *the execution* of the decree in Palestine, designate less than one of them does in describing *the object* of the decree, but yet they occur in their original and proper meaning.

The point of the objection is, that no contemporary writer mentions a general census of the Roman empire under Augustus; and therefore Luke's account is at least highly suspicious. We do not attach much weight to the *argumentum e silentio*, although it is here exalted into a powerful witness against a writer who professes to furnish a correct and orderly account of the evangelical history. By a similar mode of reasoning it might be denied, that no geometrical survey of the empire happened in the time of Augustus. Such a survey is unnoticed in all contemporary authors. Yet that it did take place there can be little doubt. It is amply attested by the *Rei Agrariae Auctores*. Thus Julius Frontinus writes:—Huic addendae sunt mensurae limitum et terminorum ex libris Augusti et Neronis Caesarum: sed et Balbi mensoris, qui temporibus Augusti omnium provinciarum et civitatum formas et mensuras compertas in commentarios contulit, et legem agrariam per universitatem provinciarum distinxit ac declaravit. In proof of the same fact might be quoted Aggenus Urbicus in his "In Julium Frontinum Commentarius"; Latinus et Mysrontius; and the "Fragmenta Terminalia." In the Preface to the Cosmographia of Æthicus Ister, a survey and measurement of the empire are also mentioned, but ascribed to Julius Caesar and M. Antony. Hence the author must have been mistaken in attributing it to Julius Caesar instead of Augustus; or it must have been different from that of Augustus.

If the geometrical survey be omitted by contemporary writers, is it strange that the general census should also be omitted? Or if the fact of omission in the latter case be an argument against the existence of the census itself, the omission in the former case is equally valid against the existence of a general measurement of the empire. The only authors from whom some notice of the general census might have been expected are Tacitus, Dio Cassius,

and Suetonius. The annals of Tacitus however begin with Tiberius. There is a chasm in Dio's history from U. C. 748 till 752, between which years the birth of Christ falls. Suetonius certainly makes no mention of the census. Still all traces of such a census are not obliterated. Mention of it may perhaps be found. We are informed by Tacitus, Dio, and Suetonius, that Augustus left behind him a *Breviarium imperii*, which he had written with his own hand, and enjoined in his will to be publicly read in the senate. In this document there was a statement of the resources of the empire. Opes publicae continebantur: *quantum civium* SOCIORUMQUE in armis, quot classes, regna, provinciae, tributa aut vectigalia, et necessitates ac largitiones (Tacit. Ann. i. 11). Does not this *breviarium imperii* imply that Augustus had taken a general census? Cassiodorus appears to allude to the same census in these words:—"Augusti siquidem temporibus, orbis Romanus agris divisus censuque descriptus est, ut possessio sua nulli haberetur incerta, quam pro tributorum susceperat quantitate solvenda." It is objected indeed by Strauss, that Cassiodorus was a Christian and a late writer; but yet his account seems to have rested on some sources of information additional to Luke's Gospel, because he notices *the geometrical survey* of the empire besides the general census. Some writers have also found traces of the imperial census in Suidas, and Isidore of Seville. The former writes under the word *ἀπογραφή*. *Ὁ δὲ Καῖσαρ Αὔγουστος, ὁ μονάρχησας, εἴκοσιν ἄνδρας τοὺς ἀρίστους τὸν βίον καὶ τὸν τρόπον ἐπιλεξάμενος ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν τῶν ὑπηκόων ἐξέπεμψε, δι' ὧν ἀπογραφὰς ἐποιήσατο τῶν τε ἀνθρώπων καὶ οὐσιῶν, αὐτάρκη τινὰ προστάξας τῷ δημοσίῳ μοῖραν ἐκ τούτων εἰσφέρεσθαι. Αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγίνετο, τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ τοῖς κεκτημένοις τί μὴ ἀφαιρουμένων· ὡς εἶναι τοῖς εὐπόροις δημόσιον ἔγκλημα τὸν πλοῦτον.* Still there is some uncertainty in this account, not that we believe it to have been *wholly* taken from the passage of Luke, as even Ebrard thinks, but because it *may* allude to what is stated of the last year but one of Augustus's reign, when the emperor sent commissioners to note down the property of cities and individuals, as Dio informs us. It is *possible* that the words may relate to the general census; but no stress can be laid on them, their credit being doubtful. The passage

in Isidore of Seville, which some quote, we consider inapplicable.

Now it is probable that the geometrical survey of the empire of which we have spoken, was connected with the general census, and perhaps preparatory to it; while the breviarium imperii of Augustus could hardly have been complete without both.

It will be seen, that the sacred writer, after stating that a decree was issued by Augustus commanding a general census, proceeds in the second verse to the census, as far as it had to do with Palestine. He was not concerned with its execution generally. He does not state how or when it was carried out in the provinces. It could scarcely have been executed in the different parts of the Roman empire *contemporaneously*. It must have been carried out in them *successively*. This may be one reason, why it has been omitted by Suetonius and contemporary writers. It would thus appear of less political importance than if it had been executed by one great simultaneous effort. The inspired historian passes at once to the relation borne by the decree to Judea; and to the great event with which divine providence connected it in that country.

2. Although the census here spoken of originated in the decree of a *Roman* emperor, yet it need not therefore be maintained of necessity that it was a *proper Roman* census, conducted by the Romans according to established usage. Judea, we are told, was not yet reduced to the form of a Roman province. Herod, as *rex socius*, had his rights which were to be respected. It is asked, whether it be at all probable, that Augustus would think of exposing Herod to a mark of subjection and dependence so humiliating as a census of Judea? Strauss and others reply in the negative.

But the *reges socii* generally were not so independent of Rome as has been represented. Their position indeed was one of external independence, but not of essential separation. Thus we learn from Tacitus, that the nation of the Clitae, though governed by its own prince, was subjected to a Roman census. Herod in particular was more dependent on the Roman emperor than any other *rex socius*. In all important matters he consulted Augustus, who had assigned him his kingdom not as a matter of justice, but

of grace. Hated by the Jews for his cruelties, particularly in the latter part of his life, he was obliged to look the more to the powerful protection of the Romans, as well as to secure the continued favour of those to whom his Jewish subjects might readily prefer their complaints, and appeal for justice. He did not venture to commence a war or conclude a peace, without making Augustus acquainted with his conduct; and even his last will, with regard to the succession to his kingdom, had to be confirmed by Rome. Towards the conclusion of Herod's reign, Augustus maintained a closer inspection over his conduct, and entertained perhaps the idea of converting Judea into a Roman province after his death. On one occasion, he caused the oath of allegiance to be taken to himself, as well as to Herod. At another time Augustus was so much offended with Herod's conduct, that he wrote to him, he should treat him in future as a subject instead of a friend, although he was afterwards reconciled to him. Twice did Herod write to Rome for permission to proceed legally against his two sons, when he received full power to proceed against them in his own way. After Herod's death, a proposal was made to Augustus by Jewish deputies, that Judea should be annexed to Syria, and ruled over by such persons as the emperor might think proper; from which it has been inferred, that the idea of converting the country into a Roman province was not a new one.

There is little doubt that Augustus, out of motives of policy, would wish to have the census of Judea conducted as mildly as possible. Hence he contented himself with a simple enrolment of names, reserving the actual valuation of property to another time. He neither wished to humble Herod, nor to excite the opposition of the people, but calmly to prepare the way for a measure which he might have foreseen as expedient or desirable, viz. the reduction of Judea to a Roman province. It is probable therefore that he committed the affair to Herod the Great himself, who was well acquainted with the disposition of the Jews. *He* would manage it as mildly as possible, in accordance with the desire of Augustus, and after the Jewish method. Thus it would be a Jewish, not a Roman census; and the people would be less liable to rebel.

But it is objected, that Josephus makes no mention of a census

under Herod, although he distinctly notices that of Quirinus. It is agreed, that, as a Jewish historian, he would naturally have alluded to the former, inasmuch as it concerned the Jews his countrymen; and because the proceedings connected with the later census accord with the supposition, that the Jews did not tamely submit to any preceding one. The difference however of the two cases may account satisfactorily for the historian's notice of the one and not of the other. That which he does mention was of great political importance; that which he omits was of less moment. They were conducted by different individuals, in different modes—the one by a Roman officer whose character, according to Tacitus, was held in no esteem; whose sordid avarice left a stain on his memory; the other by Herod, a king of their own. The one was a mere registration of names, as a step preliminary to actual taxation; the other a proper Roman census, the chief object being to ascertain the value of property. The one seems to have been attended with no resistance on the part of the Jews: the other excited an insurrection.

We have thus arrived at a census of Judea originating with Augustus, but committed to Herod, *prior* to that of Quirinus.

3. If the census here spoken of be identified with that of Quirinus, the words must be translated "*this* first census," or, taking πρώτη without the article, "*this* census, which was the first," etc. —or "the census *itself*"—first took place, when Cyrenius was governor of Syria. According to the last version (with αὐτή), ten years at least elapsed between the issuing of the edict and its execution. This supposition is very improbable. That so many years were allowed to pass away before the enrolment took place, is an idea which cannot be entertained. The third verse implies that it was carried into effect immediately.

Adopting therefore the first translation (with αὕτη), viz.:—"this was the first census which took place when Quirinus, etc.," but, unwilling to identify the well-known census under Quirinus with that here spoken of, others think, that Quirinus was employed in a first census under Herod, and that thus he had the charge of both at different times. But, as there was no president of Syria in Herod's reign, Quirinus must have conducted the first census in the capacity of an extraordinary imperial commissioner

(legatus Caesaris). In confirmation of this view, reference is made to Tacitus, who states that Quirinus was employed about this time in various extraordinary offices in the East. But the words *ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας* can hardly mean any thing else than *the proper governor* or *president* of Syria. It cannot be applied to an extraordinary commissioner. We know that the participle *ἡγεμονεύοντος* is said by these critics to be employed in an indefinite manner; but it is difficult to believe that Luke could use it so loosely. Hence although the weight of names be great in favour of this interpretation, we are unable to assent to it. It has been adopted by Ideler[g], Münter[h], and Hug[i] most recently; after Beza, Grotius, Ussher and many others in former times.

There is but a slight difference between this view and that of the expositors who understand *ἡγεμονεύοντος* in an *anticipative* sense. A translation to this effect was proposed by Lardner, and adopted by Paley and Meyer. "This was the first enrolment or census of Cyrenius, governor of Syria, that is, who was afterwards governor of Syria, and best known among the Jews by that title." Such a version is inadmissible. According to it, the article before the genitive could not be dispensed with; and instead of a participle the noun *ἡγεμών* would have been employed, *τοῦ ἡγεμόνος*.

We believe that Luke himself in the passage expressly distinguishes the census under Herod from that of Quirinus. The superlative *πρώτη* stands for the comparative *προτέρα*, the words *ἡγεμονεύοντος Κυρίνου* being dependent on it; and the translation of the sentence will be, *this enrolment was made* BEFORE *Quirinus became president of Syria.* Such is the view taken by Le Clerc, Storr, Süskind, Tholuck, Huschke, and Wieseler.

That the superlative may be used for the comparative, especially in the case of *πρῶτος*, there can be no doubt, when we find four examples of it in John i. 15, 27, 30; xv. 18; I John iv. 19.

Winer[k], with whom Fritzsche and De Wette agree, objects to this construction as inadmissible, because of the participial expression *ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρίνου*, which is made to depend immediately on *πρώτη* for *προτέρα*. In our view,

[g] Handbuch der Chronologie, ii. p. 394. [h] Stern der Weisen, p. 88 et seqq.
[i] Gutachten. [k] Biblisches Realwörterbuch, s. v. Schatzung.

it is justified by the example which Tholuck[1] adduces from the Septuagint, Jeremiah xxix (xxxvi.) 2, *ὕστερον ἐξελθόντος Ιεχονίου τοῦ βασιλέως*, equivalent to *ὕστερον ἢ ἐξελθεῖν Ἰεχονίαν*, *κ.τ.λ.* See also Sophoc. Antig. 637-8, 701-2, 703-4. Winer, indeed, objects again to the appositeness of the example from Jeremiah; but in this he and his fellow-objectors are over-fastidious, demanding good classical Greek of the evangelist.

While speaking of the state of the text, we may remark, that there is not the least necessity for altering the spirits of *αυτη* from *αὕτη* into *αὐτὴ*, as Paulus proposed. The article *ἡ* should be expunged, as Lachmann has done. Probably, also, those authorities are right which put *πρώτη after ἐγένετο* instead of *before* it: *αὕτη ἀπογραφὴ ἐγένετο πρώτη, κ. τ. λ.* The whole verse cannot be *a gloss*, as Beza, Pfaff, Valckenaer, Olshausen, Kuinoel, and others have hastily concluded.

4. The idea of a proper Roman census must be abandoned. The census was conducted by Herod in the Jewish form. And the reason of Joseph's journey to Bethlehem is given by Luke, "because he was of the house and lineage of David." If, as we think probable, it was a *census capitum*, and not an actual valuation of property at the same time, then the public records had to be consulted in order to facilitate the enrolment. Joseph's genealogical registers would be kept at Bethlehem, *the city of David.* But why, it is asked, should Mary have undertaken the journey along with her husband? In a census of Roman citizens, the women were not required to appear in person. But the present census was Jewish. The chief reason seems to have been, her critical position. In the agitation of the period, she did not wish to be left alone, *οὖσα ἔγκυος*. It was not the enrolment which induced her to accompany Joseph, but rather her own situation, as the historian himself indicates. She may not have been in a very fit state for travelling; yet she preferred the inconveniences of it, rather than being so long without her natural protector. In the meanwhile, a higher influence controlled her movements; for it had been foretold that the Messiah should be born in Bethlehem.

Another instance of false chronology imputed to Luke is

[1] Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte, p. 182, et seqq.

contained in chapter iii. 1, where Lysanias is stated to be tetrarch of Abilene, contemporaneously with Antipas and Philip. Josephus, it is true, mentions an Ἀβίλα ἡ Λυσανιόυ, and introduces one Lysanias as governor of Chalcis at Lebanon, in the proximity of which the province of Abila undoubtedly was, and who was consequently the ruler of Abilene as well as Chalcis; but this Lysanias had been put to death thirty-four years before the death of Christ, at the instigation of Cleopatra. No other Lysanias is spoken of, either by Josephus or any author writing of that period. Hence the reign of that Lysanias must have happened sixty years previously to the fifteenth of Tiberius.

Such is the objection as stated by Strauss, who concludes that the fact in question is a historical fiction. De Wette and others coincide with him.

Here again the *argumentum e taciturnitate* is too highly exalted. The notices bearing on the point are scattered throughout the writings of Josephus and Dio Cassius. We shall refer to them separately.

1. In Josephus, B. J. i. 13, 1. we are informed, that Lysanias succeeded his father Ptolemy, the son of Menneus, in the government. What that government was, may be seen from Antiq. xiv. 7, 4, where it is stated, that Ptolemy, son of Menneus, was ruler of Chalcis under Mount Libanus. Thus Lysanias was governor of Chalcis. Josephus gives no title to Lysanias, neither that of *king* nor *tetrarch*. It is not said, moreover, that he ruled over Abilene. But it is probable that Abilene was united with Chalcis, in being subject to the same ruler, for they were contiguous. Ebrard, indeed, keeps Chalcis and Abilene quite distinct, as though they may have been distant, or at least under separate governors; but this is not the only instance in which he goes to an extreme in combating Strauss and B. Bauer. Towards the end of his life, Lysanias is styled by Dio Cassius, *king* of Ituraea, a part of Arabia, his territories having been enlarged by Anthony.

2. He was put to death at the instigation of Cleopatra, xv. 4, 1.

3. A great part of his dominions was bestowed by Anthony on Cleopatra, πολλὰ τῆς Ἀραβίας τῆς τῶν Ἰτυραίων (Dio). Josephus does not contradict, but rather agree, with this testimony of Dio, provided we include in the expression τὴν τῶν Ἀράβων, xv. 4, 1,

the dominion of Lysanias, as we are prompted to do by Dio's words, xlix. 32, and by Antiq. xv. 5, 3. The words of Josephus are not obscure: *Λυσανίαν μὲν οὖν τὸν Πτολεμαίου Πάρθους αἰτιασαμένη τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐπάγειν, ἀποκτίννυσιν. ἤτει δὲ παρ' Ἀντωνίου τήν τε Ἰουδαίαν καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἀράβων, ἀξιοῦσα τοὺς βασιλεύοντας αὐτῶν ἀφελέσθαι. . . . . ἵν' οὖν μητ' ἀρνηθῇ παντάπασι μηθ' ὅσα προσέταττεν ἐκείνη διαπραξάμενος ἐκ φανεροῦ δόξῃ κακὸς, μέρη τῆς χώρας ἑκατέρου παρελόμενος τούτοις αὐτὴν ἐδωρήσατο.* (Antiqq. xv. 4, 1).

We do not know what befell the portion of Lysanias' territories not given to Cleopatra. Wieseler conjectures that it remained to his heirs.

4. Herod farmed of Cleopatra the parts of Arabia she had received from Anthony (xv. 4, 2). Probably he continued to do so till her death.

5. About this time Zenodorus or Zeno, had hired the house (*οἶκος*) of Lysanias (xv. 10, 1. B. J. i. 20, 4). But Zenodorus associating with robbers and sharing the plunder, Trachonitis, Batanea and Auranitis were taken from him by Varro, president of Syria, and given by Augustus to Herod. This Zenodorus is denominated *tetrarch* by Dio, and on several coins. Whether the *οἶκος τοῦ Λυσανίου* was taken from him by Augustus is uncertain. The emperor may have restored it to the rightful heirs, or he may have retained it in his own hands in consequence of peculiar circumstances connected with those heirs, such as their nonage, etc. etc. At the death of Zenodorus, which took place soon after, his country was wholly assigned to Herod (xv. 10, 3). If *Abilene* be identical with *the house of Lysanias*, then did Herod the Great receive the latter from Augustus at this time, as is proved by comparing a passage in Antiq. xv. 10, 3, with another in xvii. 8, 1. In the former it is written:—*Καῖσαρ δὲ καὶ τὴν τούτου μοῖραν οὐκ ὀλίγην οὖσαν Ἡρῴδῃ δίδωσιν, ἥ μεταξὺ τοῦ Τράχωνος καὶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἦν, Οὐλάθαν, καὶ Πανιάδα, καὶ τὴν πέριξ χώραν.* Now *Panias* belonged to *Abilene;* and in two parallel passages, *μέρη τινὰ τοῦ Ζήνωνος οἴκου* in the one, is synonymous with *Panias* in the other, (B. I. ii. 6, 3, and Antiq. xvii. 8, 1). Herod acquired possession of these territories about U. C. 734.

6. On Herod's death, Augustus gave to Philip a part of Zenodorus' possessions (B. J. ii. 6, 3. Antiq. xvii. 11, 4).

Here there is ample room for supposing that a descendant of the former Lysanias received the remainder of Zeno's dominions, which will account for the circumstance of Philip's obtaining no more than a part of them. Probably the rest were in the hands of a younger Lysanias.

7. Josephus first speaks of *the tetrarchy* of Lysanias after Caligula had ascended the throne U.C. 790. It was given by that emperor to Agrippa (xviii. 6, 10).

8. Claudius confirmed Agrippa in the possessions he had received from Caligula, and added new ones. Among the additions is specified *Abila of Lysanias*, which was a part of *the tetrarchy* of Lysanias (xix. 5, 1). "Now when Claudius had taken out of the way all those soldiers whom he suspected, which he did immediately, he published an edict, and therein confirmed that kingdom to Agrippa which Caius had given him, and therein commended the king highly. He also made an addition to it of all that country over which Herod, who was his grandfather, had reigned, that is Judea and Samaria. . . . . But for *Abila of Lysanias*, and all that lay at Mount Libanus, he bestowed them upon him as out of his own territories." These words, compared with (xviii. 6, 10), "he (Caius) also gave him the tetrarchy of Lysanias," shew that Caius merely promised to give Agrippa the tetrarchy of Lysanias, but that it was not actually conferred till the reign of Claudius.

9. Claudius afterwards gave to Agrippa II. that part of his father's territories embraced by the former tetrarchy of Philip, and *Abilene the tetrarchy of Lysanias* (xx. 7, 1. B. J. ii. 12, 8).

The question now arises—Was the Lysanias mentioned by Josephus when describing the times of Caligula and Claudius, the same Lysanias who was killed by Anthony? If this be so, there will be an interval of more than seventy years. It is possible, as Winer thinks, that the more ancient and celebrated Lysanias impressed his name on a district; while the Lysanias noticed by Luke is not alluded to by Josephus. The language of the Jewish historian is consistent with the fact of the Lysanias of Anthony's time being referred to in the expressions ἡ Λυσανίου

τετραρχία (xviii. 6, 1); Ἀβίλα ἡ Λυσανίου (xix. 5, 1); βασιλεία ἡ Λυσανίου καλουμένη (B. J. ii. 11, 5); ἡ Λυσανίου βασιλεία (B. J. ii. 12, 8). In that case territories once belonging to Lysanias are mentioned as still bearing his name. It seems to us, however, much more probable that a younger Lysanias, the person noticed by Luke, is meant by Josephus in the passages in question, for the following reasons:—

1. The Jewish historian does not speak of the existence of a *tetrarchy* belonging to Lysanias, till ten years after the notice by Luke.

2 Josephus never calls the Lysanias of Anthony's time *tetrarch*, nor does he even call him *ruler of Abilene* or *Abila*. He calls him ruler of *Chalcis*.

3. The division of Palestine into *tetrarchies* was not made till after the death of Herod the Great.

4. The Lysanias of Cleopatra's time reigned but six years.

5. In modern times a coin was found bearing the inscription Λυσανίου τετράρχου καὶ ἀρχιερέως[m]. This coin belongs to the period after Herod's death. An inscription was also discovered by Pococke on the remains of a Doric temple, called by the Arabs the tomb of Nebi Abel, the ancient Abila, which makes mention of *Lysanias, tetrarch of Abilene*[n]. Both the coin and the inscription refer to a period subsequent to Herod's death[o].

These considerations lead us to identify the Lysanias spoken of by Josephus in the times of Caligula and Claudius, with the Lysanias of Luke's Gospel.

The same view is confirmed by the fact, that the territories of the murdered Lysanias are said to have been *farmed* by Zenodorus, a fact that agrees best with the existence of a minor to whom they properly belonged. Zenodorus, says Josephus, farmed *the house* of Lysanias, implying that the family was not extinct. Taking the time into consideration, it is probable that the younger Lysanias of Luke may have been a grandson of the first. He may even have been a son.

But although it is not of *essential* importance to the credibility

[m] Sestini, Lettere e Dissertazioni numismatiche, tom. vi. p. 101, tab. ii.
[n] Pococke's Description of the East, vol. ii. part i. chap. v. pp. 115, 116.
[o] See Hug's Gutachten über das Leben Jesu, etc. pp. 122, 123.

of Luke to prove that Josephus always speaks of one and the same Lysanias, it is of great moment in respect to the evangelist's authority to prove, that after the death of Herod the Great, Philip did not receive the tetrarchy of Lysanias in addition to the other provinces over which he ruled. For if Philip were then in possession of the tetrarchy of Lysanias, there is no room for the existence of a younger Lysanias about the time of Christ's entrance on his public ministry. Paulus has endeavoured to prove, that the words of Luke harmonise with the idea of Philip possessing the tetrarchy of Lysanias after Herod's death. But the text of Luke, and the testimony of Josephus, are alike opposed to the supposition.

Paulus seems to have abandoned his former conjectures in regard to alterations in the text of Luke. In his Commentary, he had advised the erasure of τετραρχοῦντος after Ἀβιληνῆς, according to L; or that the words should be καὶ τῆς Λυσανίου Ἀβιληνῆς, in which case τετραρχοῦντος would belong to Φιλίππου. But authority is decidedly against such arbitrary assumptions. Hence he abides by the common reading in his Exegetical Handbook, rendering it "*And being tetrarch of Abilene of Lysanias*," which violates the obvious construction of the sentence. Paulus thinks that Philip received the tetrarchy of Lysanias, because Josephus writes (xvii. 11, 4), that "Batanea with Trachonitis, as well as Auranitis, with a certain part of what was called the house of Zenodorus, paid the tribute of one hundred talents to Philip;" and in like manner (B. J. ii. 6, 3), "Batanea, and Trachonitis, and Auranitis, and certain parts of Zeno's house about Jamnia, with a revenue of a hundred talents, were made subservient to Philip." Here the οἶκος of Zenodorus is identified with the tetrarchy of Lysanias. But to this it may be answered, that Zenodorus simply *farmed* the οἶκος Λυσανίου. It did not properly belong to him. Besides, the tetrarchy of Lysanias is distinguished from that of Philip (xviii. 6, 10): καὶ βασιλέα καθίστησιν αὐτὸν τῆς Φιλίππου τετραρχίας, δωρησάμενος αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν Λυσανίου τετραρχίαν. This passage is decisive of the question.

We leave the subject with the following observations:—

1. Ἄβιλα ἡ Λυσανίου, mentioned by Josephus as belonging to Claudius Caesar, and given by him to Agrippa I., is at

once identified with Chalcis which was governed by Lysanias, son of Ptolemy, 34 B.C. Here is *an assumption* in Strauss' reasoning.

2. Although it is perfectly natural to suppose that there was a younger Lysanias, a descendant of the former, who bore the title of tetrarch between U.C. 734 and 790, yet it is concluded that there could have been no such person, because Josephus, *as is assumed*, mentions none other. Here is a manifest defect in the reasoning of Strauss and Bauer.

3. We have said, *it is assumed* that Josephus speaks of none other, although it is far more probable, that the Lysanias in the passages relating to the period 790 U.C., was the very person called *tetrarch* by Luke.

4. Even though it should be admitted that Josephus speaks of but one Lysanias, and Luke of another, by what kind of reasoning is it at once inferred, that the one mentioned by Luke could not have existed? The silence of Josephus, and of every other writer, would not invalidate the fact spoken of by the evangelist, unless that fact could be proved impossible on other grounds.

But Luke has also been blamed for contenting himself with a vague reference to the time of Christ's public ministry (iii. 23); whereas in (ii. 1) he has endeavoured to mark the year of the Redeemer's birth with accuracy. Here there is generality in one case, and precision in another; two modes irreconcilable in the same writer. So reasons Credner. This is a singular objection. It implies a strange notion of contradictoriness on the part of the Giessen theologian. The precision in the previous instance (ii. 1, 2), in addition to the exact defining of John the Baptist's public appearance, *superseded the necessity* or *expediency* of marking with accuracy the date of our Lord's entrance on his ministry. Thus there is perfect wisdom, and we may add, perfect propriety, in the course followed by Luke.

Credner has also directed attention to the myths and traditional sayings which the first two chapters contain, as invalidating the historical credibility and critical character of the Gospel. It would be out of place to enter here into a full vindication of the accuracy of every thing denominated mythic or traditional. The

entire theory of myths in the Gospels we believe to be baseless. It is easy to *assume*, that all beyond the region of the ordinary and the natural—every event of a supernatural and miraculous nature—is mythical; but the sober inquirer will pause before proceeding to expel the miraculous from the evangelical narrative. He will hesitate to adopt that *negative criticism* which gives the rein to *subjective caprice*, and leaves nothing positive or settled in Christianity, by a procedure contrary to the principles of true philosophy.

The fact that Mark has omitted to relate such portions of the evangelical history as are contained in the first two chapters of Luke, forms no argument against the truth and accuracy of the account, because it can never be shewn that Mark excluded them from his Gospel because of their suspicious character. Doubtless the evangelist had other reasons for omitting them, just as he has omitted many particulars found in the other Gospels.

The alleged contradictions between Matthew and Luke have have been already considered under the head of the *first* Gospel, since most assume that they militate against the *first*, not the *third* Gospel. Credner himself adduces against the apostolic origin of our present Greek Matthew *the traditions* embodied in the first and second chapters, because they contradict particulars in the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel. At one time he infers that Luke is correct, and on that ground condemns Matthew; while, at another time, he assumes that Luke is incorrect in the very same part of his Gospel, because it is irreconcilable with Matthew. Such reasoning is certainly suicidal.

VIII. Integrity.

Formerly various authors ventured to affirm, that the first two chapters, with the exception of the preface, were not written by the evangelist. But the style and diction evince the same author; while all MSS. and versions concur with internal evidence. The arguments against the integrity of the Gospel are on the whole so weak, that no modern critic attaches any value to them. The only objection to the portion in question worth mentioning is its absence from Marcion's Gospel. But we are informed by Tertullian, that the same document wanted the third chapter, and the fourth

as far as the thirty-first verse. Thus the argument proves too much. Besides, Marcion's Gospel was confessedly a mutilated copy of Luke's, as has been proved by recent writers.

The forty-third and forty-fourth verses of the twenty-second chapter have been also suspected. Several writers have pronounced them spurious. They are omitted in many MSS.; and, in one version, the Sahidic; as also in an important codex of the Vetus Itala. In various codices they are marked with asterisks or obeli; and sometimes they are placed after Matthew xxvi. 39. It is remarkable that both A. and B. omit them.

On the other hand, the paragraph was quoted by Justin Martyr and Irenaeus; and Epiphanius reasons from it to prove the double nature of Christ. The words of the last-mentioned father are important: "It is found in Luke's Gospel in those copies which have not been revised; and the holy Irenaeus, in his work against heresies, uses it as an argument to confute those who say that Christ was manifested *in appearance;* but orthodox persons removed it through fear, not understanding its bearing and great force" (Ancorat. sec. 31). Here the meaning of the term ἀδιορθώτοις has been disputed. Mr. Norton explains it, in those copies "*which had not been revised, i. e.*, inspected, after the transcriber had done his work, by some person responsible for the correctness of the text." We cannot think this to be the meaning intended by Epiphanius. The succeeding context shews that it denotes copies *not corrected, i. e.*, not conformed to certain sentiments. Hilary of Poictiers says, that *very many* Greek and Latin MSS. omitted the paragraph. Jerome again states, that *some* copies contained it.

On the whole, the external evidence is not sufficient to invalidate the genuineness of the words. Even Lachmann has not expunged them. Judging from critical authority, they cannot be called *certainly* genuine; but they are *probably* so. It is likely enough that they were omitted by some of the orthodox, as Epiphanius asserts, from doctrinal prepossessions; because the strengthening of Jesus by an angel, and his bloody sweat, appeared unsuitable to his divinity.

The following is the amount of internal evidence stated against the passage by Norton:—

(*a*) The agony of Christ is represented as existing *after* the angel had been sent to strengthen him.

(*b*) The bloody sweat described is such as we have no authority for believing was ever produced by mere distress of mind.

(*c*) The account is at variance with the calmness, self-possession, and firmness of Christ.

(*d*) No one was present to witness or become acquainted with the event related. And if Jesus subsequently told it to his disciples, Matthew could hardly have forborne to relate it. In that case all the evangelists should have mentioned it.

To these particulars we reply briefly:—

(*a*) The angel was sent not to *exempt* Jesus *from* the agony, but to enable him to endure it. The sufferings are always represented as having to be endured. The cup could not pass from him untasted.

(*b*) Was the bloody sweat physiologically impossible? The true interpretation of the words is doubtful. They may mean, either that the sweat itself was bloody *wholly* or *in part*, or that the perspiration was *like* drops of blood descending to the ground. The latter exposition seems to us the preferable one. According to it, Jesus's distress of mind is described as most intense. It was such as to force out from his body a copious perspiration of a viscous nature, which fell down to the ground in large drops like blood. Even on the other view of the passage, viz. that the sweat was sanguineous, the statement could be defended on physiological grounds, as Gruner has shewn; but it is unnecessary to cite examples from the region of physiology, since the text speaks of the drops being *like* blood, rather than being *of* it.

(*c*) It is difficult to perceive the justness of this objection. If it be true, it would go to impugn the genuineness of much more that is narrated not only by Luke but by Matthew and Mark, respecting Jesus's agony in the garden, and his exclamations on the cross. His firmness and fortitude were displayed in meeting death perseveringly amid indescribable suffering.

(*d*) The fact that none was present with the sufferer does not at all prove that Luke must have been ignorant of the event before us. Jesus may have related it afterwards. De Wette indeed pronounces it improbable that Jesus should have spoken

of it after his resurrection; but the reason of the alleged improbability is not given, and we are unable to discover it. And then the affirmation, that Matthew, if knowing it, must necessarily have spoken of it, will prove too much. He knew various facts of which he does not speak in his Gospel, such as the raising of Lazarus. In short, his silence argues nothing against the historic reality of the facts.

IX. Contents.

The Gospel may be conveniently divided into five parts:—

1. Narrative of the birth and childhood of John the Baptist, and of Jesus, i. 4 — ii. 52.

2. Circumstances preparatory to Christ's public ministry, iii. 1 — iv. 13.

3. His appearances in Galilee as the Messiah, iv. 14 — ix. 50.

4. Discourses and events in Galilee and on his last journey to Jerusalem; with his triumphal entry into the city, ix. 51 — xxi. 38.

5. History of his apprehension, crucifixion, death, resurrection and ascension, xxii. 1 — xxiv. 53.

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

We shall consider,—

I. The Writer of the Gospel.
II. The Time and Place at which his Gospel was written.
III. Its Authenticity.
IV. Its immediate Occasion and Object.
V. The Characteristics of it.
VI. Comparison of its Contents with those of the synoptical Gospels.
VII. Its Integrity.

I. Notices of the Writer.

John was the son of Zebedee, a fisherman on the sea of Galilee, and probably belonging to Bethsaida. His mother's name was Salome. He seems to have been younger than James his brother, because with one exception (Luke ix. 28), the latter is always mentioned first.

John's parents were probably in easy circumstances, although Chrysostom represents the family as very poor, because Zebedee himself is said by Matthew and Mark to have mended his nets. We must, however, carefully distinguish between sober truth and rhetorical statements. Zebedee had not only a boat and nets, but hired servants (Mark i. 20). The employment of fishing was a lucrative one. Salome ministered to the Lord of her substance, and joined with other women in purchasing sweet spices for embalming His body. John took the Blessed Virgin home to his house, situated perhaps in Jerusalem. These circumstances serve to shew that John's parents were not poor; and therefore he need not be supposed to have wholly wanted education in his youth.

John followed the occupation of his father. Perhaps his mind was not neglected by his mother, who appears to have been looking for the consolation of Israel. Under the watchful care of a pious parent, the youthful mind of the son was early led to the

Messiah, whose advent was anxiously looked for. Nor were the instructions of Salome lost on John; for when the Baptist appeared as the forerunner of the Messiah, preaching repentance, John became his disciple. His first acquaintance with *Jesus* was at the banks of the Jordan, when the Baptist pointed to the latter as He walked, "Behold the Lamb of God!" This striking testimony arrested Andrew and John. Irresistibly attracted to the person so designated, they followed Him with reverential respect, not daring to express their resolution of attachment. But the gentle Redeemer invited them to the place of His abode, where they spent several hours in his company. Here their susceptible spirits received the first gracious impression from their future Lord. And what an impression was that now made on their docile minds by converse with Jesus! It was a new influence infused into their being—the commencement of a divine life. They returned to their former occupation with other feelings, Jesus not calling them to His intimacy at this particular time. The process of thought which had been awakened in their bosom was nurtured for a short while apart from the Great Teacher, amid the silence of their occupation on the sea of Galilee, where the still beauty of the sleeping waters by night favoured contemplation.

His proper call to be a follower of Jesus is related in Matt. iv. 21, etc., Mark i. 19, etc., with which the passage in Luke v. 19, etc. seems to be identical. The sons of Zebedee were fishing at the lake when, at the summons of the Master, they left father, property, ship, nets, and all that they had.

Peter, James, and John, were specially admitted to the intimacy of Jesus. They were privileged to witness actions and miracles which the other apostles were not favoured to behold. Among the three thus distinguished, John was honoured with *the peculiar* affection of his Master. Hence he styles himself *the beloved disciple, the disciple whom Jesus loved*, without mentioning his name. At the last supper, he leaned on the bosom of the Saviour; from which circumstance, in connection with the mutual affection existing between them, he has been called ἐπιστήθιος. When the Redeemer was apprehended, John, with Peter, followed Him into the hall of the high priest, where Peter was admitted at John's request. But not only did his affection for Jesus lead him

into the hall of Caiaphas; he attended the crucifixion also. Immediately before He expired, Jesus affectionately recommended the care of His mother to the beloved disciple, a duty which was doubtless performed with the most tender faithfulness. After the burial, having been informed by Mary Magdalene that the body had been removed, he hastened to the sepulchre. He seems now to have returned to fishing on the sea of Galilee, as may be gathered from xx. 19-29. Subsequently to the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, we find him in company with Peter, standing before the Sanhedrim, and boldly confessing the name of Jesus. On a later occasion, these two apostles were sent to Samaria, that through them the converts might receive the Holy Ghost. On comparing the Epistle to the Galatians with the Acts of the Apostles, it would appear that John was present at the council of Jerusalem, and was in high reputation as one of the church's pillars in that place. At what time he left the metropolis at last cannot now be ascertained. Nicephorus relates, that he left Jerusalem after the death of Mary, A. D. 48; while another account says, that she accompanied him to Ephesus, where she died and was buried. Both traditions are historically uncertain. When Paul paid his last visit to the city, A. D. 59 or 60, John was not there, James being the only apostle in Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 18, etc.). We learn from Eusebius[a], who, however, introduces the circumstance as a report, that those of the apostles and disciples of the Lord still surviving, came together from all parts to consult about a successor to James. Little reliance can be placed on the truth of this late story.

The latter part of John's life was spent in Asia Minor. This fact rests on the testimony of Irenaeus, a disciple of Polycarp, John's disciple. It is also affirmed by Clement of Alexandria, Apollonius, Polycrates, Origen, and Eusebius. But it is probable that the apostle did not take up his abode in the country till after Paul had been put to death; whether A. D. 70, as Du Pin conjectured, or 66, as Tillemont and Lardner imagined, cannot be determined. Had he been at Ephesus while the great apostle of the Gentiles was labouring in the cause of the Gospel through Asia Minor, some mention of him would have been made. Paul

[a] H. E. iii. 11.

did not build on another man's foundation; and if John had been preaching in Asia Minor before him, that field of labour would not have been chosen by Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles. Besides, in the striking address to the elders of the church at Ephesus, and in his epistles written from Rome to the Ephesians, Colossians, Timothy, and Philemon, John is not noticed. Hence it is most probable that John did not come to Asia Minor till after A. D. 64, the year in which Paul suffered martyrdom.

It is the uniform testimony of antiquity, that John survived all the apostles, dying at a very advanced age. According to some authorities, he died at the age of 120; according to others, 100; others, 89. Irenaeus, however, who is the oldest witness, specifies no particular age[b], but merely says, that he lived till the time of Trajan, who began to reign A. D. 98. According to Polycrates[c], Origen[d], and Eusebius[e], he died at Ephesus; their language leading us to infer that it was a natural death. Chrysostom, however, misapprehending Matt. xx. 23, assigns him the honour of martyrdom. The term *μάρτυς*, applied to him by Polycrates, refers to his alleged banishment, not to the manner of his death. It is generally allowed that he remained unmarried. Hence the epithets which he has received, *παρθένιος*, *παρθένος*, *virgo*.

According to ancient testimony, John was banished to Patmos. But there is much diversity as to the time of the exile, and the Roman emperor by whom he was sent away. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Tertullian, seem not to have known who the emperor was. The first writes: *Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος, ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου τῆς νήσου μετῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἔφεσον*[f], *κ. τ. λ.* "When, after the death of the tyrant, John had returned to Ephesus from the isle of Patmos." Origen writes: *Ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς, ὡς ἡ παράδοσις διδάσκει, κατεδίκασε τὸν Ἰωάννην μαρτυροῦντα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς Πάτμον τὴν νῆσον*[g]. "And a Roman emperor, as tradition teaches, banished John into the island of Patmos, for the testimony he bore to the word of truth." Tertullian says: Felix ecclesia (Romana) . . . . . ubi apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur[h]. "The apostle John, after

[b] Ap. Euseb. H. E. iii. 23. [c] Ibid. v. 24. [d] Ibid. iii. 1. [e] Ibid. iii. 23.
[f] Ibid. iii. 23. [g] Comment in Matt. T. xvi. 6. [h] De praescriptt. c. 36.

he had been put into a vessel of burning oil and come forth unharmed, was banished to an island." According to Irenaeus, who is followed by Eusebius, Jerome, Sulpicius Severus, and others, the emperor was Domitian. Thus Irenaeus writes: *Οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη (ἡ ἀποκάλυψις) ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς*[i]. "It was seen not long ago, but almost in our age, at the end of the reign of Domitian." To the same effect Jerome: Quarto decimo igitur anno, secundam post Neronem persecutionem movente Domitiano, in Patmos insulam relegatus, scripsit Apocalypsin[k]. "Domitian, in the fourteenth year of his reign, raising the second persecution after Nero, John was banished into the island Patmos, where he wrote the Revelation." Epiphanius calls the emperor, Claudius: "John prophesied in the isle of Patmos, in the reign of Claudius;" and, in another place, "John wrote his Gospel in his old age, when he was above ninety years old, after his return from Patmos, which was in the time of Claudius Cæsar." *Αὐτοῦ . . . . . τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου . . . . . δὲ προφητεύσαντος ἐν χρόνοις Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος ἀνωτάτω, ὅτε,*[q] *κ. τ. λ. . . . . ἐπὶ τῇ γηραλέᾳ αὐτοῦ ἡλικίᾳ, μετὰ ἔτη ἐννενήκοντα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς, μετὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου ἐπάνοδον, τὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου γενομένην Καίσαρος*[m]. Other authorities mention Nero, such as the Syriac version[n], Theophylact[o], and the younger Hippolytus[p]. Dorotheus, on the other hand, represents him as Trajan[q]. Eusebius, who follows Irenaeus, specifies the fourteenth year of Domitian, and relates an ancient saying, that John returned to Ephesus in the reign of Nerva[r]. In this particular he is followed by Jerome. Tertullian, as we have seen, unites a fabulous legend with the fact of the banishment.

It is not surprising that most critics in recent times should have suspected or denied the truth of this ecclesiastical tradition relating to John's exile. It has an air of the fabulous that excites scepticism. Attention has been strongly directed to the

[i] Ap. Euseb. iii. 18. [k] De vir. illustr. c. 9. [l] Haer. Li. 33. [m] Ibid. 12.
[n] The literal translation of the inscription of this version is: "The revelation which was made upon John the evangelist by God, in the island Patmos, into which he was cast out by Nero Cæsar."
[o] Praef. in Comment. in Joann. [p] Chronic. fragm.
[q] See Mill's N. Test. p. 197. [r] H. E. iii. 20.

important differences existing in the patristic notices respecting *the time* of banishment; while the chronological opposition of Irenaeus' statement to Apoc. xvii. 9, and the fact that Origen and Eusebius call it a mere λόγος (*saying*), or παράδοσις (*tradition*), have also been urged. The entire story appears to us to have been originally drawn from the words contained in the ninth verse of the first chapter of the Apocalypse. Here we must look for its proper source. The fact which is stated in this passage was dressed out somewhat differently by ancient writers.

All that can be inferred with certainty from Apoc. i. 9 is, that John was obliged to leave the place where he had been residing, and to retire to Patmos, for adherence to the Word of God. The fact is so far a historic truth. There is no ground for inferring with Eichhorn and others, that the abode in Patmos is a mere fiction—a local dress which the poet throws around his visions. It occurs in *the introduction* to the book, where the narrative is simple prose.

II. Time and Place at which the Gospel was written.

In regard to *time*, some think that it was written *before*, others *after*, the destruction of Jerusalem. The former is advocated by Basnage, Lampe, Lardner, Owen, Michaelis, Stuart[r], who generally place it about A. D. 70. In proof of their opinion, these writers quote the words of the fifth chapter, second verse:—ἔστι δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα . . . . . πέντε στοὰς ἔχουσα. "Now there *is* at Jerusalem, by the sheep-market, a pool . . . . . *having* five porches." Here the verb ἔστι, not ἦν, is used, implying that the pool Bethesda existed; while the participle ἔχουσα, prefixed to πέντε στοὰς, shews that the five porches were still standing.

This argument is inconclusive. Eusebius and Jerome, in their Chorographia of Judea, speak of the pool as well known in their time, so that the Romans do not seem to have destroyed it by causing it to be dried up; and it is quite natural for the position of it to be described ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ, *at the sheep-gate*, though that gate had been destroyed. But the clause, "*having* five porches," may be looked upon as confirmatory of the fact that

[r] Notes to Fosdick's Translation of Hug's Introduction, p. 728.

Jerusalem was then standing. We do not say, with Hug, that ἔχουσα has the signification of *the imperfect* tense, "which *had* five porches," for this is unnatural. Vespasian did not demolish every thing in the city, but allowed several things to remain for the use of the garrison which was to be stationed there; and why may not these porticoes, so convenient to bathers, have been permitted to stand. Thus there is no need to resort to an *enallage temporis*, as though *the present* tense stood for *the imperfect*. All can be explained naturally without such an expedient.

Stuart thinks, that if Jerusalem had been destroyed, some hint or expression of feeling in relation to that melancholy event —some appeal to the prophecy of our Saviour respecting it as having been fulfilled, must have appeared here and there in the Gospel. The apostle, he thinks, could not have failed to mention so striking and palpable a proof of Jesus being the Messiah.

But it is impossible for us to judge correctly of what was natural to John, amid the influences and circumstances under which he wrote his Gospel. What may seem natural to us *now*, had we been placed in his position, may have been in reality inapposite.

The same writer founds an argument for the early composition on John xxi. 18: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, when thou wast young thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not." As Peter's martyrdom took place A.D. 67, or near that time, how, it is asked, could John, or some disciple of his who added the last chapter, have omitted to refer to the death of Peter, which had happened some thirty years before?

We are unable to see the force of this consideration. So far from a remark respecting Peter's crucifixion thirty years before having been appropriate in the connexion, it would have been superfluous, because the fact was so well known.

Others contend that the Gospel was not written till the close of the first century, from 97 to 100. In proof of this opinion, Hug has adduced passages, such as xi. 18, xviii. 1, xix. 41, where the imperfect tense ἦν, not the present ἔστι, is applied to localities connected with Jerusalem.

But this argument is as little conclusive as we have seen the reverse of it to be; for it is common to speak of past things in the present time as if they continued in the same state as before. But the entire character of the Gospel points to a period subsequent to the destruction of the Jewish polity, when the writer, entirely freed from Jewish conceptions, and able to take a comprehensive view of the Christian religion, exhibits the maturity of religious development. The purity of the Greek language he employs, a fact best seen from comparing the Gospel with the Apocalypse, is also an argument confirmatory of the same lateness of date. We are aware, indeed, that many circumstances serve to modify the force of this consideration. The matter of the Apocalypse, which was prophetic, an imitation of Old Testament ideas and diction, as well as other circumstances, combined to render the language of that book very different from the phraseology of the writer on other subjects. Still however after every deduction has been made, there is some weight in the consideration adduced. The diction of the Gospel *does* shew a writer more familiar with the Greek language than the author of the Apocalypse: one who had lived among persons speaking it, and had been accustomed to their modes of expression.

The early fathers, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, testify that John wrote after the other three evangelists. But this opinion rested on no other foundation than the assumption, that his Gospel was intended to be supplementary to theirs. They endeavoured to bring down the composition of it to as late a period as possible, that thus they might plausibly represent John as combating various heresies. Hence the testimony of the fathers generally on the question of *time* cannot be considered valuable. Apart however from all external evidence, we consider, with Greswell, the lateness of the composition to be an incontrovertible point, by disputing which little credit or advantage would be gained.

With respect to *place*, Irenaeus states[t] that John wrote the Gospel at Ephesus. The facts of his life, as far as they are known, harmonise with this opinion. Later fathers however mention Patmos. Others, as the author of *Synopsis Sacrae Scripturae*,

[t] Ap. Euseb. v. 8.

endeavour to unite both by affirming that John dictated the Gospel in Patmos, and had it afterwards published in Ephesus, through the instrumentality of Gaius. This combination of the two opinions is arbitrary, and evidently devised on purpose to reconcile conflicting statements. On the whole, there is no good reason for departing from the testimony of Irenaeus.

III. Authenticity.

The most ancient testimony to the authenticity of the Gospel is probably that contained in the twenty-fifth, and part of the twenty-fourth verses of the twenty-first chapter. If, as we think, they did not proceed from the author of the Gospel itself, but from some of his friends and disciples connected with the Ephesian church or otherwise, they afford the earliest and most indubitable proof of the fact, that the beloved disciple and sacred author were identical.

The next testimony in favour of the early existence of our Gospel may be found perhaps in the New Testament itself. Thus in the second epistle of Peter i. 14, we read: "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ has shewed me." Here there seems to be an allusion to what is related in John xxi. 18 respecting the mode of Peter's death, so that this apostle was both acquainted himself with the fourth Gospel and also presupposes an acquaintance with its contents on the part of his readers.

The next witness perhaps, who is available as evidence for the authenticity, is Ignatius, bishop of Antioch. Although even the shorter recension of his epistles is not free from interpolations, yet its substantial genuineness cannot well be questioned. Some of the epistles bear internal evidence of their *originality* more than others, such as that addressed to the Romans, which is distinguished from the rest by this characteristic. In that epistle we find these words: *οὐχ ἥδομαι τροφῇ φθορᾶς, οὐδὲ ἡδοναῖς τοῦ βίου τούτου. Ἄρτον Θεοῦ θέλω [ἄρτον οὐράνιον, ἄρτον ζωῆς], ὅς ἐστι σάρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . . . καὶ πόμα [Θεοῦ] θέλω, τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος [καὶ ἀέννaος ζωή].* "I take no pleasure in the food of corruption, nor in the pleasures of this life. I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus

Christ, the son of God . . . . . and the drink I desire is his blood, which is incorruptible love."

The writer seems thus acquainted with the sixth chapter of John's Gospel; for the leading idea of the passage, as well as the mode in which it is expressed, are based on John vi. 32, 34, 45, 51-58. The connexion between them is pretty obvious, and the most natural mode of accounting for it is by assuming that Ignatius was familiar with the Gospel.

There is another passage which probably refers to our Gospel, iii. 8 and 16. It is in the epistle to the Philadelphians: *ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ πλανᾶται, ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ὄν. Οἶδεν γὰρ, πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει, καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέγχει.* "Yet the spirit being from God is not deceived. For it knows both whence it comes and whither it goes, and reproves secret things."

Other places in the letters of Ignatius have been thought to contain allusions to the Gospel; but their testimony is so indistinct that they should not be adduced.

The next witness is Polycarp. In the seventh chapter of his epistle to the Philippians we meet with these words: *πᾶς γὰρ, ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστος ἐστι.* "For whoever does not confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is an antichrist."

If Polycarp was acquainted with the first epistle of John from which these words must have been taken (iv. 3), he could not have been ignorant of *the Gospel* written by the same author.

Papias, as we are assured by Eusebius[u], made use of testimonies from the first epistle of John, whose authorship cannot be separated from that of the fourth Gospel, notwithstanding the opinion of Weisse and Baur.

The epistle to Diognetus, formerly attributed to Justin Martyr, and supposed by Semisch to belong to the time of Justin[x], has a texture and colouring plainly derived from John's writings. Allusions, more or less obvious, to the first epistle and to the Gospel, occur in various places, such as *χριστιανοὶ ἐν κόσμῳ οἰκοῦσιν, οὐκ εἰσὶ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.*

[u] H. E. iii. 39.

[x] See Otto, De Justini Martyris scriptis et doctrina, p. 53, et seqq.

"Christians dwell in the world, but they are not of the world" (John xvii. 11, 14, 16).

[*ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ*] *ἔπεμψεν ὡς ἀγαπῶν, οὐ κρίνων.*

"God sent his own Son as loving, not condemning" (John iii. 17).

πρὸς οὓς ἀπέστειλε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, οἷς τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ βασιλείαν ἐπηγγείλατο καὶ δώσει τοῖς ἀγαπήσασιν αὐτόν.

"To whom he sent his only begotten Son, to whom he promised the kingdom in heaven, and will give it to them that have loved him" (John iii. 16, 17, and 1 John iv. 9).

Polycrates, contemporary with Irenaeus, and bishop of Ephesus, speaks of John as "he who leaned on the Lord's breast," *ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσὼν*[y], in which expressions we recognise a reference to the mode in which the beloved disciple is described in the Gospel, particularly to xiii. 25, and xxi. 20. How the apostle could be characterised in this manner, independently of the Gospel's existence, Baur is unable to shew.

The recent researches of various critics to whom allusion was formerly made, have shewn that Justin Martyr knew and quoted, in his own manner, *all* the Gospels. We shall refer to a few passages, from which his acquaintance with John's may be inferred.

ὁ χριστὸς εἶπεν· ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσιν ἐστι[z].

"Christ said, Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven; and that it is impossible for those once born to enter into the wombs of those that bare them is manifest to all." The resemblance of this passage to John iii. 3-5 is too apparent not to be recognised. In the words *ὅτι δὲ καὶ, κ. τ. λ.* Justin identifies himself with Nicodemus, for he uses them as his own.

In his Dialogue with Trypho, we also meet with the following: —*ὡς τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρωπείου σπέρματος γεγεννημένου, ἀλλ' ἐκ θελήματος θεοῦ*[a].

"His (Christ's) blood was produced, not of human seed, but of the will of God."

[y] Euseb. H. E. v. 24. [z] Apol. i. 61. [a] Cap. 63.

Here there seems to be an allusion to John i. 13, a supposition which is particularly confirmed by the fact, that Irenaeus, in referring to the same passage, has ος with the singular verb, ὅς ἐγεννήθη, meaning *Christ* was born, a peculiarity in which Tertullian follows him.

Another passage, suggesting the fourth Gospel as its origin, is in his first Apology. ἐκεῖνόν [θεὸν] τε καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα . . . . . πνεῦμά τε . . . . . σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες[b].

"We worship Him [God], and also the Son who came forth from Him, and the Spirit, and adore, honouring them in word and truth."

The resemblance of the last words to those of John iv. 24 is tolerably plain. Λόγῳ instead of πνεύματι, was evidently employed quite synonymously, because of πνεῦμα preceding.

In the Dialogue with Trypho, eighty-eighth chapter, John the Baptist is spoken of as announcing the baptism of repentance, clothed with a garment of camel's hair, and having on a leathern girdle, etc. Πρὸς οὓς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐβόα· Οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ φωνὴ βοῶντος, κ. τ. λ.

"To whom also he himself cried, I am not the Christ, but the voice of one crying in the wilderness," etc.

Though the Gospels generally may have furnished Justin with these words, yet the express affirmation of John that he was not the Christ, but merely a voice crying, could only have been taken from the fourth.

Other allusions to the Gospel of John, more or less apparent, have been often adduced, but they appear more precarious than those now given, and might perhaps be explained on the hypothesis that Justin did not know our Gospel. Thus the doctrine of the Logos presented in his writings may most probably be attributed to the father's acquaintance with John's works, although it is possible to derive it, as Grimm supposes, from Paul's epistles and that to the Hebrews. It were to be wished, indeed, that the allusions to our Gospel made by Justin had been more unequivocal and unambiguous—that he had relied less on memory,

[b] See Burton's Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 15, et seqq. Theological works, vol. ii, part 2.

and quoted more accurately. The difficulties connected with the hypothesis that the fourth Gospel belonged to the *ἀπομνημονεύματα ἀποστόλων* are considerable, and we have no wish to overlook them. They are so great as to induce even Lücke and Grimm to assume that Justin did not make use of the Gospel *directly* and *immediately*. These writers suppose that the Gospel was current in the circle in which he lived and moved, and that the indefinite references he makes to the document shew his unacquaintedness with it from *actual perusal*. But the perplexities in the way of this hypothesis are greater than those connected with the assumption of his having known and read the Gospel. We cannot believe that he had not all the four written Gospels before him. Whatever vagueness may attach to his citations from the fourth, and whatever explanations of their origin may be given by Eichhorn, Marsh, or Credner, it is most probable, on the whole, that he was acquainted with our Gospel. He lived, however, at an uncritical time, when it was considered a matter of no moment to quote accurately. Except in long passages, considerable freedom is taken with the original words of the Gospel, a fact which shews us that he did not hold the identical words in great veneration. He combines different passages of the evangelical history, inserts his own expressions, abridges sentences, and adapts to his purpose the written sentiments of the inspired evangelists.

We have already seen, that Tatian's harmony or *διὰ τεσσάρων*, presupposes the use of the four Gospels by this disciple of Justin. It is in vain to say of the work in question, with Stroth, Credner, and others, that it was an independent Gospel which Tatian found and introduced among his sect. The very title given to it by himself, as Eusebius informs us, as well as by Epiphanius and Theodoret, shews that the contents of four Gospels were treated in it in the way of harmony. What four Gospels they were admits not of a doubt; and the authority in which they were then held must have been all but exclusive, else the attempt to reduce them to harmony would not have been made. The height of scepticism cannot deny that they were our four canonical Gospels. John's was one of the four, since we learn from Bar Salibi that Ephrem the Syrian explained the *Diatessaron* in a Commentary, and that it began with, "In the beginning was

the Word." Perhaps the old harmony that still exists in Latin, commencing, In principio erat verbum, was derived substantially from Tatian's. In his oration against the Gentiles, there are clear traces of an acquaintance with the fourth, as may be seen from the following:—*πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδὲ ἕν.*

"All things are by him, and without him was not any thing made" (John i. 3).

τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἄρα τὸ εἰρημένον· ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει.

"This is what is said: the darkness comprehendeth not the light" (John i. 5).

πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός. "God is a spirit" (John iv. 24).

The passages quoted from Tatian's oration against the Gentiles are admitted, even by Baur, to be unquestionably in John's manner. They shew undoubtedly that the fourth Gospel was current about A.D. 170—that it had obtained canonical authority at that time, and consequently that it was regarded as an authentic production of the apostle. The *mode* in which it is referred to, indefinite as it is, *τοῦτο τὸ εἰρημένον, this has been said*, implies the Gospel's general acceptance, shewing that it was not at all necessary to ascribe expressly to John as the author, a writing universally acknowledged as such by his readers.

Apollinaris of Hierapolis, a contemporary of Tatian, had also the Gospel of John, as we infer from a fragment in the Alexandrian Paschal Chronicle::—*καὶ ὁ παῖς Θεοῦ τὴν ἁγίαν πλευρὰν ἐκκεντηθεὶς, ὁ ἐκχέας ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς αὐτοῦ τὰ δύο πάλιν καθάρσια, ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα, λόγον καὶ πνεῦμα.*

"The Son of God, pierced in the sacred side, who shed forth from his side the two things again cleansing, water and blood, word and spirit." In these words there is an allusion to John xix. 34, 37.

Another fragment of the same father furnishes evidence to the same effect. He is speaking of certain parties who affirm that our Lord ate the paschal lamb with his disciples on the fourteenth of Nisan, and therefore suffered on the fifteenth (the Quatuordecimani), making Matthew to speak as they understand him; after which he adds:—*ὅθεν ἀσύμφωνός τε νόμῳ ἡ νόησις αὐτῶν· καὶ στασιάζειν δοκεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια.*

"Whence their interpretation is contrary to the law; and the Gospels seem, according to them, to be at variance with each other."

Here the Gospels (*τὰ εὐαγγέλια*) can only mean *the written* canonical Gospels, viz. Matthew, mentioned in the preceding context by Apollinaris, and John.

It appears therefore from Apollinaris, that the *Quatuordecimani* and their opponents acknowledged the authority not only of the synoptical Gospels, but likewise of John's.

Contemporary with Tatian and Apollinaris was Athenagoras, who in his *Embassy* concerning the Christians has the following:— *ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ· πρὸς αὐτοῦ (αὐτὸν?) καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο.*

"But the Son of God is the Word of the Father, in form and energy: for Him and by Him were all things made."

Surely the allusion to John i. 3. is too obvious to be denied, especially in connection with the following context.

In the epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, though John the apostle is not named, there is a verbal quotation from his Gospel:—*ἐπληροῦτο δὲ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν εἰρημένον, ὅτι ἐλεύσεται καιρὸς, ἐν ᾧ πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας ὑμᾶς, δόξει λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ.*

"Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by our Lord, that the time shall come when whosoever killeth you, will think he doeth God service" (John xvi. 2).

Whoever was the author of the epistle in question, whether Irenaeus, as Valesius thinks, or another, there is no reason for doubting its genuineness. The quotation shews that the Gospel was current in the West when the epistle was written.

The school of the Valentinians, which began to flourish from the middle of the second century, held the Gospel in great repute as an apostolic production. It admits indeed of doubt whether Valentinus himself made use of the Gospel, as long as the authenticity of the *πιστὴ σοφία* is problematical; but it is certain that his followers employed it as canonical. Irenaeus does not affirm that the founder of the sect was acquainted with it, but at the same time he makes no statement warranting either directly or indirectly an opposite conclusion. Hence his testimony is neutral.

But Tertullian thinks that he did employ it, for he says of him[c], *Valentinus integro instrumento uti videtur.* The Valentinians, according to the express statement of Irenaeus, endeavoured to confirm their peculiar Gnostic notions by passages chiefly taken from the prologue. Qui a Valentino sunt, eo quod est secundum Joannem, plenissime utentes ad ostensionem conjugationum suarum[d].

Heracleon the Valentinian wrote a Commentary on our Gospel, of which several fragments have been preserved in the works of Origen. It has been remarked indeed, that John is not once named in these fragments as the author of that Gospel; but if it had not been deemed an important book at the period, Heracleon would scarcely have undertaken to write a Commentary on it. Nor is it probable that Origen would have omitted to notice the fact of Heracleon's rejecting the apostolic origin of the work, had the latter really denied its authenticity.

Ptolemy, another disciple of Valentinus, wrote a letter to Flora, preserved by Epiphanius[e], in which a passage occurs that has also been adduced to prove an acquaintance on the part of the Valentinian school with the present Gospel. The words are these:—*ἔτι γε τὴν τοῦ κόσμου δημιουργίαν ἰδίαν λέγει εἶναι, ἅτε πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γεγονέναι οὐδέν. Ὁ ἀπόστολος προαποστερήσας τὴν τῶν ψευδηγορούντων ἀνυπόστατον σοφίαν καὶ οὐ φθοροποιοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ δικαίου καὶ μισοπονήρου.*

If this passage be not corrupt, it shews that Ptolemy attributed the Gospel to an apostle. Grabe, however, looks upon it as mutilated. Perhaps, even on this supposition, the resemblance of a part of it to John i. 3. will remain indisputable.

Jerome (on Matth. xxiv. 5), quotes from the *voluminibus* Simonis *Magi*, a passage manifestly derived from John's Gospel: Ego sum sermo Dei . . . . . ego Paracletus. This shows that the Gospel was recognised by the Valentinian school.

From the fragments of Celsus' work against Christianity, entitled *ὁ λόγος ἀληθής*, *The True Word*, which have been preserved in Origen's reply, it may be inferred that he was not unacquainted with the four canonical Gospels. In regard to

[c] De praescript. haeret. c. 37. [d] Adv. Haeres. iii. 11. § 7.
[e] Haeres. xxxiii. § 3.

John's, if he had not read it himself, it is at least probable that he knew it indirectly. It must have been current in those circles in which Celsus lived, for there are traces of its influence on them obviously appearing in his attack on Christianity. Without insisting on the truth of the fact that he himself used the Gospel, a fact which cannot be satisfactorily established amid the paucity of evidence, it may be confidently asserted that he was acquainted with it through the instrumentality of the Christians among whom he was placed. For example, he thus apostrophises Jesus:—

"But you! what great or wonderful thing, either in word or deed, did you perform? You shewed us nothing, though the Jews called on you in the temple (*ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ*) to give some manifest sign that you were the Son of God" (*παρασχέσθαι τι ἐναργὲς γνώρισμα, ὡς εἴης ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ παῖς*). Here the allusion must be to John ii. 18, for in no other Gospel is it related that the Jews demanded of Jesus *in the temple* a proof of his Sonship.

In another place, Celsus applies to Christ the language *ἥκειν ἄνωθεν υἱὸν θεοῦ* (Orig. i. 50); and also *φῶς καὶ ἀλήθεια* (ii. 49). Further, when Celsus says that, according to the Christian fable, Jesus shewed after his resurrection *τὰ σημεῖα τῆς κολάσεως καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ὡς ἦσαν πεπερονημέναι*, the allusion to John xx. 27 is obvious. And when he asks scoffingly "Who saw this? a woman almost frantic, as ye say; and if there be any other belonging to the same imposture," etc., the reference to Mary Magdalene's appearance at the grave, as described by John, seems to have been principally before his mind.

Other passages formerly quoted to demonstrate Celsus' acquaintance with our Gospel, furnish but doubtful evidence of the fact, and are rarely cited since the time Bretschneider subjected them to a sifting examination. But those now mentioned cannot be set aside. Making allowance for the confused, uncritical mode in which Celsus employed the Gospels, it cannot well be denied that the church of that day received, not only the first Gospel, but also the fourth.

The first writer who expressly attributes our Gospel to John is Theophilus of Antioch. The passage is found in his work in defence of Christianity (book ii.) addressed to Autolycus: *ὅθεν διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς ἅγιαι γραφαὶ, καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματόφοροι, ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει. ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος· καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν*

θεὸν . . . . . ἔπειτα λέγει· καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος· πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν.

"The Holy Scriptures teach us, as well as all who were moved by the Holy Spirit, among whom John says: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God.' . . . . . Then he says, 'and the Word was God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made.'"

We are also informed by Jerome, that Theophilus wrote a commentary on the four Gospels, now lost: Quatuor evangelistarum in unum opus dicta compingens, etc. (Epist. 53 ad Algas.); and, Legi sub nomine ejus *in evangelium* et in Proverbia Solomonis commentarios (De vir. illustr. 25). This fact is inconsistent with the opinion that the Gospel was written in the second century, shortly before the time of Theophilus; while it affords sufficient evidence, by the side of Tatian's harmony, that none other than our four Gospels were at that time regarded as authoritative by the general voice of the church. Here were two writers, Tatian and Theophilus, nearly contemporary, who treated our four Gospels in the way of harmony, shewing that they considered them at that time as *canonical* writings—*the exclusive standard* of faith and practice.

The testimony of Irenaeus in favour of the Gospel before us is both unequivocal and important. When it is considered that he came from Asia Minor to Gaul, and therefore virtually united in himself the tradition of the Eastern and Western Churches; that he had been acquainted in his youth with Polycarp, having been a hearer of that venerable disciple of John the apostle; that his mind was of a decided antignostic tendency, averse to speculation, and could have had little partiality for the Gospel on the ground of individual taste; that he opposed the Valentinians, with whose sentiments the Gospel was readily brought into coincidence, he becomes a most valuable witness in favour of the authenticity of our Gospel, because he exercised great influence on the catholic church in his day. When we find the Valentinians on the one hand, and their great opponent on the other, alike admitting the apostolic origin of it, there can be little doubt as to the position it occupied in the catholic church towards the close of the second century. The passages in which he quotes the Gospel, attributing it to John the apostle, are numerous, and need not be adduced.

Tertullian, the representative of the Latin church in Africa, also acknowledged the work as an authentic production of John, as he quotes from every part of it, and utters no suspicion of its canonicity. Amid all the variations of his creed, he appears to have adopted the Gospel without hesitation as the Apostle's work. That it was in the canon of the Roman church, at the commencement of the third century, might be inferred from Tertullian, even if the anonymous fragment in Muratori, composed probably in the second century[f], did not furnish clear proof of the fact.

It is also worthy of notice, that the canon of the Syrian church contained the Gospel of John. The old Syriac version, which must be referred to the second century, contains it. When we reflect that several books of the New Testament are not in that ancient translation, such as the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, that of Jude, and the Apocalypse, its testimony in favour of our Gospel is all the more valuable.

It is superfluous to refer with particularity to the Alexandrian church, which recognised the book, at least from the commencement of the third century, as is witnessed by Clement and Origen. The learning and labours of the latter led him to collect and compare early testimonies for and against the authenticity of the sacred books, so that it is not too much to say, that he would have detected the spuriousness of our Gospel had it proceeded from another than John. His critical investigations afford the strongest presumption in favour of his conclusions respecting the canonical books.

Dionysius, the pupil of Origen, who combats the authenticity of the Apocalypse on critical grounds, seems never to have doubted that of the Gospel.

Eusebius, too, had no hesitation in placing our Gospel among the *ὁμολογούμενα*, or books universally received, though the historian took great pains in collecting and weighing the evidence of early writers regarding the canon.

Thus early external evidence establishes the apostolic origin of our Gospel.

And yet the sacred document in question has been assailed on

[f] See Wieseler's essay in the Studien und Kritiken for 1847, Heft 4, and Credner zur Geschichte des Kanons, p. 71, et seqq. Both writers agree in fixing the composition of the fragment about A. D. 170, in opposition to Zimmermann, who places it in the fourth century, and to Hug, who puts it into the third.

external and historic grounds by various writers since the seventeenth century. It was reserved, however, for Lützelberger[g] to carry out opposition to it to a greater length than any preceding author. In his hands, external testimony loses all its value in favour of the canonical authority of John's Gospel.

Although the work of this sceptical writer contains perhaps little *substantially* new—for all his arguments are a virtual expansion of those advanced by Vogel, Bretschneider, and others—yet it deserves attention from the startling conclusions it advances, the approval it has met with from various quarters, and the apparent influence it has had in the production of Schwegler's and Baur's works. A work characterised by so competent a judge as Bleek[h] as the most important attack made upon the Gospel in modern times, cannot well be passed by in silence.

Till the time of Vogel, it had been universally assumed as an indisputable fact, that John the apostle lived and laboured in Asia Minor during the latter part of his life. The doubts of that sceptical writer met with no response, till Lützelberger attempted, with minute skill, to destroy the credit of the ecclesiastical tradition on which the fact rests.

We shall present an outline of his argumentation, and endeavour to refute it.

About the commencement of the first century, numerous heresies, or germs at least of heresies, had appeared in the church, embodying doubts more or less distinct of the birth, incarnation, ministry, and resurrection of Jesus. Now had John been still living, as is asserted, all who entertained these doubts, or desired to know the certainty of matters extensively called in question, would have flocked to him, that they might at once be assured of the truth. The positive teachings of the apostle must have been well known through Asia Minor in particular, as well as in other districts; and yet how remarkable is it, that in the very region where he lived so long, and through which he travelled instructing the churches, the sects of the Cerinthians and Docetae met with so much acceptance? It is still more strange, that an entire silence rests on the history of John before the time of Irenaeus. He is

[g] Die kirchliche Tradition über den Apostel Johan. und seine Schriften in ihrer Grundlosigkeit nachgewiesen. 1840, 8vo. [h] Beiträge, p. 88.

mentioned by no ecclesiastical writer prior to the bishop of Lyons. Ignatius, though combating all forms of error in his seven epistles, does not speak of the apostle; and yet on his journey to Rome he met with Polycarp, the apostle's disciple and friend. Though he might have learned from him many particulars of the life and doctrines of his preceptor, which would have been welcome to the readers of epistles to whom he often speaks of their connection with apostles, yet he never alludes to John, even in the letters addressed to the Ephesians and to Polycarp, where mention of him might have been expected. And yet he notices Paul and Peter in the epistles to the Ephesians, Trallians, and Romans. Again, in the letter to the Smyrnians, he adduces every possible consideration which could tend to refute the Docetae; and, in that to the Philippians, he combats the Jewish Christians, without a single allusion either to the oral teaching or written compositions of John, suitable as they might have been to his purpose. In addressing the Philippians, he introduces Paul, not John, although the latter might have been appropriately cited as one of the examples of patience in the ninth chapter, if the story of his banishment to Patmos had been true.

Hegesippus also, who came from Asia Minor, and flourished between A. D. 150-180, gave no information about John in his five books of memorable things; though he travelled much with the view of satisfying himself respecting the right succession of bishops, and their adherence to the orthodox faith; for Eusebius has faithfully extracted from the works of this writer all the notices of the apostles; and it is highly improbable that the historian would have overlooked anything relating to our apostle, who was his favourite among the twelve.

The testimony of Irenaeus is without weight or worth, since none upholds his general judiciousness or credibility. The very theologians who rely on his evidence respecting John, do not receive it in all particulars. The information he gives on the point before us, from the tradition of the Asiatic presbyters and churches, is either absurd or demonstrably false. Among *the absurd* may be classed the statement made by John to the presbyters of Asia Minor, as to what he had heard from the Lord about the millennial period, when huge grapes and immense grains of wheat were to grow.

In the same category should be placed Polycarp's narration, recorded by Irenaeus, relative to John's meeting Cerinthus at the bath and fleeing from the place. On the other hand, the statement said to be attested by all the elders, that Jesus was upwards of forty years of age, is manifestly *false*. So also the statement about Papias being a disciple of the apostle John; the assertion, taken from tradition, that John saw the visions of the Apocalypse in Patmos towards the end of Domitian's reign; and his incorrect explanation of the number 666. Irenaeus too, when very young, was a hearer of Polycarp's, and therefore might readily make mistakes in after years about the particulars he had heard from him: Even on the supposition that the Gnostic Florinus, whom Irenaeus seeks to influence by the authority of their common preceptor Polycarp, was a youth at the time he heard the latter, Polycarp's doctrine could scarcely have claimed the express approbation of the apostle John, else Florinus would not have fallen into Gnosticism; or, having adopted that heresy, he would have been reclaimed.

The story told by Clement of Alexandria of a young man in a city of Asia not far from Ephesus, which presupposes the truth of the tradition that John lived in that city, is so like a *myth* or *legend*, that it can prove nothing.

On the part of Clement of Rome there is also a total silence respecting John's history, in his first epistle to the Corinthians. But if the apostle had been still living at Ephesus, when Clement wrote (about the year 96), is it not strange that the church of Corinth should have applied to the bishop of Rome instead of an apostle—and also that Clement should not have referred them to John? Though Peter is mentioned in the fifth chapter of Clement's letter, along with Paul, as an example of suffering, John, who was imprisoned and scourged along with the former, is unnoticed. And yet the example of John, imprisoned, scourged, and exiled to Patmos, must have had great influence with the Corinthians. In like manner, Luke does not speak of John in the preface to his Gospel. Had the latter been alive when the evangelist was about to write, it is strange that Luke should not have gone to him for the purpose of receiving from the mouth of the only surviving eye-witness of the events contained in the evangelical history, a direct account of them.

But, indeed, how could Luke, or the Corinthian church, have had recourse to John, since the latter was dead even when Paul wrote to the Galatians, A. D. 55-59? This is apparent from Gal. ii. 12, where the apostle of the Gentiles says of Peter, James, and John, the three heads of the Jewish-Christian church at Jerusalem, "whatever they were," or, "whatever they *were formerly.*" Had *all three* been then alive, the writer could not have used the adverb ποτὲ, or the imperfect ἦσαν. But it is certain that Peter and James were then living. Hence the departed one could have been none other than John the apostle. For these reasons the tradition respecting John's abode in Asia Minor, and his extreme old age, must have arisen from the confounding of him with John the Presbyter termed, "a disciple of the Lord," who certainly lived in Asia Minor till the close of the first century, and was buried at Ephesus.

Such is a brief abstract of Lützelberger's argumentation against the current tradition of the ancient church. The particulars of which the reasoning consists form together an *argumentum a silentio*, which is valid only when a *positive necessity* can be demonstrated. We shall now subject the whole to a summary review.

With regard to the germinant heresies of Asia Minor, and John's relation to them on the supposition of his living in the region where they arose, this writer contemplates them from a point of view entirely modern. When the active labours of the apostle Paul are contemplated in connection with his perpetual disputations against false teachers, and the springing up of heresies in the churches he planted or visited, especially at Corinth and in Galatia, it will not appear strange that errorists should have appeared in the theatre of John's ministry. The presence and influence of Paul, gifted as he was with much greater energy than John, could not prevent heretical sentiments. If such was the case with the apostle of the Gentiles, much more may it be predicated of the beloved disciple whose habitude of mind was the *contemplative* rather than the *combative;* and in whom spiritual reflection mellowed by increasing years predominated over the outgoings of practical ability. We cannot tell precisely the amount of deference paid to apostolic authority by those who had

renounced heathenism but a short time. How far an infallible inspiration was supposed to belong to them, cannot be ascertained by us who live so remotely from the apostolic age. It is certainly arbitrary to assume that the mere authority or opinion of one such as John, could have exerted an annihilating influence on error; or, that he must have lived in the centre of a wide circle preserved pure by the power of his theological instructions. The human mind, emancipated from the yoke of paganism, could scarcely have been confined within the sober limits of evangelical truth, without a miracle; especially as John's doctrinal creed presented the elements of a Gnosis to which Docetic views would readily attach themselves.

The silence of Ignatius about John in his epistles to the Trallians (ch. 5.), to Polycarp, and to the Ephesians, will not seem remarkable, when it is considered that there was no necessity to introduce the apostle into them—no urgent reason for specifying him. When we reflect that John was distinguished from Paul and Peter by his contemplative cast of mind, so that his influence was less external and prominent, it does not seem surprising that the two former should have been referred to by Ignatius, and the latter unnoticed.

The passage in the twelfth chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians might have had the name of John along with that of Paul; but its genuineness is very questionable. In the Syriac version published by Cureton, the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth chapters are wholly wanting; and the entire epistle scarcely exceeds in in length *a third part* of the two Greek recensions. The passage in the epistle to the Trallians too, is found only in the larger recension, not in the shorter. Besides, in the Syriac version of Cureton, the epistle in question does not appear; the fourth and fifth chapters of it being presented as the conclusion of the epistle to the Romans, and the words appealed to by Lützelberger being wholly absent. In combating teachers of error, it must be allowed that this father does not appeal to the oral instructions of John; but the circumstance is neutralised by the fact that he also omits to mention those of any other apostle, not even excepting Paul. When he combats Judaism, he does not refer to the apostle of the Gentiles. It is replied indeed by Lützelberger, that the Judaists

did not acknowledge Paul's authority, as they did that of John. Ignatius however does not address the Judaists directly, but his own hearers, whom he warns against the errors of Judaism; and we know that these hearers recognised the apostolic authority of Paul.

Among the examples of patience given by Polycarp in the epistle to the Philippians, John could scarcely have been introduced with propriety. The only one of the apostles there specified is Paul, after whom the rest of the apostles are mentioned generally. The argument founded on the omission of John's name by Polycarp proves too much; for even the well-attested historic fact of the martyrdom of James, our Lord's brother, is passed by.

Nothing, in short, can be inferred from the silence of Ignatius or Polycarp to invalidate John's residence in Asia Minor. In none of their extant epistles does there appear a pressing reason for introducing the apostle's name or example. The brevity of Polycarp's epistle, and the want of connection between John and the Philippian church, combine to justify the writer's silence on the point. We learn too from Eusebius, that the bishop of Smyrna left other letters behind him, to which Irenaeus refers Florinus; and it is not improbable, that John's name may have been introduced into some of them.

Clement of Rome, in the fifth chapter of his epistle to the Corinthians, speaks of "the most faithful and righteous pillars of the church that have been persecuted even to the most grievous deaths;" and therefore *simple banishment* could not have entitled our apostle to specific notice.

It is illogical to assume of Hegesippus, that because nothing is said about the apostle in the fragments of his works preserved by Eusebius, the historian met with nothing in them relating to him. In the very same remains, nothing is said of Peter, though he was the representative of Jewish, nor of Paul, the representative of Gentile Christianity. Hence it is arbitrary to assume, that Eusebius could have found no notice of John, or that he extracted every thing relative to the apostles. The hypothesis is equally gratuitous and improbable.

The mode in which Lützelberger deals with the testimony of Irenaeus is most illogical. Because that father has several tradi-

tions which are absurd or false, it is inferred that the tradition respecting John's residence in Asia Minor belongs to the same class. It is possible that it may be of the same nature; but whether it be *really* so, must be proved on other grounds. Irenaeus narrates several things obviously fabulous, believing them perhaps to be true; but it does not thence follow that *all* the traditions he relates are likewise fabulous. He may have been credulous — his judgment may have been weak — his critical sagacity small—and yet many of his narratives may be accurate and true. Besides, all the particulars in Irenaeus to which objection is made, seem to rest on a different foundation from that on which the apostle's ministry in Asia is based. They were derived from ecclesiastical tradition, or the statements of Asiatic elders who may or may not have been able to separate truth from falsehood. But, on the contrary, the direct testimony of Polycarp is given by Irenaeus in favour of the historical fact before us. Here an immediate disciple of John is the voucher; there, elders of Asia, whose names and history are alike unknown.

The passage addressed to Florinus by Irenaeus, evinces a vivid recollection of Polycarp's teachings. The bishop of Lyons would scarcely have ventured to appeal to the doctrines of Polycarp in confutation of the heresies of his former fellow-hearer, if he had not retained a distinct remembrance of them. Had Polycarp's connection with the apostle been fabulous, Irenaeus in that case would have become an object of ridicule to Florinus. The matter was not difficult to remember. There was nothing complicated about the simple historic fact of the familiarity which had subsisted between John the apostle and Polycarp. Here the memory would not be taxed, nor the understanding subjected to a severe test. Irenaeus' memory may have been fallacious, and his judgment small, and yet the fact before us remain unimpaired. It is utterly improbable that he could have been mistaken in recalling to the recollection of Florinus, certain particulars relative to their former preceptor, obviously implying the reality of John's abode in Asia Minor. The case will admit of large allowances for failure of mental powers, and for assumptions contrary to the interesting language of Irenaeus, who states that he was always in the habit, by the grace of God, of recalling the facts faithfully to mind;

while nothing but *extreme scepticism* will fail to admit that the bishop of Lyons was not mistaken in believing thus much, that Polycarp represented himself as one who had conversed with John in Asia Minor.

Perhaps all the statements branded by Lützelberger as absurd or false, should not be discarded so unceremoniously. The account indeed of the immense vines and ears of wheat growing during the millennium, is sufficiently ridiculous. The imagination of the person thus describing the period of one thousand years, attempted to carry out in a literal and gross form an idea apparently intimated in Christ's expression recorded by Matthew xxvi. 29. The attempt to develop the symbolic language in an enlarged and modified shape, rendered it revolting to good taste.

As to the anecdote of John's meeting with Cerinthus in a bath-house at Ephesus, there is nothing absurd or improbable about it. Irenaeus gives it on the authority of persons living in his day, who heard Polycarp relate it; and in the absence of all information relative to the credibility of the witnesses, it is surely rash to reject the story.

The testimony of all the elders that Jesus was more than forty years old, is pronounced by Lützelberger manifestly false. But the presbyters in question did not assert that Christ was more than forty years of age. They merely said that Christ taught *aetatem seniorem habens*, by which we should understand the age required among the Jews for entering on the office of a public teacher. Irenaeus draws an erroneous inference from John viii. 57, respecting the *aetas senior*, thinking that it could only be applied to one above forty; but the elders of Asia Minor did not fall into the same error.

Again, Irenaeus does not say that Papias was a disciple of John *the apostle*, but merely of John. It is therefore unjust to attribute to that father what he does not affirm.

In regard to the statement that John was favoured with the visions of the Apocalypse towards the end of Domitian's reign, the mistake is one which any writer may have made deliberately, and which has been adopted as a correct opinion by many subsequent writers; while his explanation of the number 666 is an ingenious attempt to solve an enigmatical problem. But surely

these failures have no proper bearing on the present question, except by a process of argumentation which every sound logician would ridicule as the veriest caprice.

The story told by Clement of Alexandria respecting the youth who became a robber and was reclaimed by John, is pronounced *mythical* by Lützelberger, because it implies the abode and ministry of John in Asia Minor. Granting it however to be a *legend*, is it absolutely and purely such? Has it no basis? Is not Asia, the scene of the story, *the historic basis* on which the whole was built? It is contrary to the ordinary views of mythical interpreters to sweep away even the implied locality, as well as the particulars of the narrative itself. Clement had travelled in Greece and Asia Minor, and had therefore ample opportunities of knowing the ecclesiastical tradition regarding John. It is quite possible that he may have collected several particulars connected with the apostle which were fabulous; but it is impossible to conceive of the fabrication of a fact like that of his ministry in Asia Minor.

The silence of Clement of Rome in his epistle to the Corinthians respecting John can prove nothing. The church of Corinth was founded and built up by Paul. It had no connection with our apostle. Clement was considered to be a disciple of Paul, and therefore it was a natural step in the distracted church to apply to him. Besides it is not certain whether John was alive when the letter to the Corinthians was written; for neither the year of John's death, nor that of the epistle's composition, can be definitely settled. There can be little doubt that they were nearly contemporaneous.

The argument founded on the silence of Luke in the preface to his Gospel, evinces a singular misapprehension of the circumstances of the period, and a transference of modern views to an age very dissimilar. It supposes that Luke could have had a sufficient motive for undertaking a journey to John; and that he was both in a condition and a place presenting no obstacle to it when he was about to write. Neither of these suppositions can be proved. Till they be, the argument is worthless. The apostolic men of that age were entirely indisposed and unaccustomed to set out on expeditions of inquiry. Hence Papias,

collecting traditions and sayings concerning Jesus, did not make journeys of inquiry, but asked what were the declarations of the elders "if he met with any one who had been their follower."

The inference drawn from Gal. ii. 12, that John was dead when the epistle to the Galatians was written, is singularly incorrect. It is gratuitous to assume that *ποτέ* refers to time, when it is apparent that it qualifies and strengthens *ὁποῖοι*. The past tense *ἦσαν* does not belong to the time when Paul was writing, but to the period of his meeting with Peter, James, and John, in Jerusalem, as is proved by the aorist *προσανέθεντο* in the context.

In conclusion, it is nothing more than a bare assertion to affirm, that the entire tradition of John's residence in Asia originated in confounding him with John the presbyter who lived and died at Ephesus. In some instances, the ancients may have attributed to the one what properly belonged to the other; but it is quite obvious that they did distinguish them. They were credulous enough, and liable to make many mistakes; but it was reserved for modern scepticism to convert them into such blundering and superstitious individuals, as to believe that John lived in Asia Minor! The single testimony of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus in the latter part of the second century, and who was the eighth Christian bishop of his family, is sufficient to annihilate the attempt of Lützelberger; for in his letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, he says expressly that John died at Ephesus (Euseb. H. E. v. 24). If the facts questioned by Lützelberger be untrue, there is an uncertainty in all ancient history, however attested. But they are too intimately associated with undoubted events to be discarded with any shew of reason. The principles, or rather the arbitrary procedure of Lützelberger, if carried into the region of early history, would annihilate all that is valuable in it. Hence it is idle to reason with men who transfer the destructive negations of their modern criticism to men and times essentially different; for in applying the same standard to both, they equally violate common sense and sound philosophy.

Having reviewed Lützelberger's attempt to sweep away the evidence relating to the most important period of John's life from the field of historic truth, let us now look at the objections to the Gospel's authenticity from external sources.

And here all that has been advanced amounts to little more than the assertion, that the external evidence is so indefinite and insufficient, as to fail in establishing the apostolic origin of the Gospel. It is difficult to say what evidence would be satisfactory to some. Much depends on the disposition with which they commence their researches, for they may have a strong feeling against the acceptance of all testimony, except what the circumstances of the case do not warrant. It is natural to seek for express and direct testimonies; but they cannot always be found. In the field of criticism, approximations to historic truth will necessarily constitute the results beyond which an inquirer cannot go. He must combine the materials before him, weigh minute circumstances, and draw conclusions in many cases where *irresistible evidence* is wanting. He must be often contented with *probability* instead of certainty. It is idle to demand *tangible* proof on every occasion.

The case before us is simply this:—In the second half of the second century it is attested by credible witnesses, that the Gospel of John was universally adopted by the Catholic church as an authentic work, whereas there is no express testimony of the same fact at an earlier date, or none at least which affirms that the apostle John wrote it. How then are we to deal with it from the time of its alleged composition till the latter half of the second century? Are we to suppose that it was unknown in that period, or that it did not exist much sooner? Did the opinion commonly entertained by Catholic Christians in the time of Irenæus diffuse itself with so much rapidity, and take so deep root in men's minds within the brief space of a very few years, that it could not be dislodged, though it was erroneous? Is there an absolute blank before the first half of the second century regarding the very existence of such a document? Was there no early tradition concerning its apostolic origin deserving of credit?

Much has been said of the superstitious credulity exhibited by the most ancient fathers, their want of discernment, their being deceived by writings pretending to be apostolic, and their uncritical habitude of mind. Such exaggerated statements have been made regarding them, for the purpose of affixing general discredit to their sentiments. But it may be fairly granted that

they were ignorant of scientific criticism, and therefore liable to be misled in judging of the authenticity of documents, without impugning their general credibility. They did not abandon themselves to the caprice or fraud of others, as if they had no more disposition towards truth than falsehood. In *matters of fact* they were credible witnesses; and in the case of the Gospels, it is difficult to see the motives they could have had for adopting them as authentic, authoritative productions, if they suspected their spuriousness. On the contrary, they had strong inducements not to receive them till they were convinced of their real character.

The apostolic fathers present themselves as the first witnesses for the authenticity of the fourth Gospel. Here however our information is scanty and indefinite. Barnabas and Clement of Rome do not mention the book, while traces of acquaintance with it are wanting even in Ignatius. Polycarp, John's disciple, evinces ignorance of its existence; while Papias, who if he was not a direct hearer of the apostle, certainly moved within the sphere of his influence, is equally ignorant. Thus the apostolic fathers afford no proof of the Gospel's sacred origin. Is not this fact suspicious? Should we not have expected Polycarp at least, and Ignatius too, to have cited the work? Does not the relation they bore to John himself justify the expectation?

If we consider the circumstances in which the apostolic fathers were placed, and the habits of the early Christians generally, it will cease to appear singular that they did not expressly quote the four Gospels. They were unlearned men converted from heathenism. Christianity took hold of their spirits, impressing it with the living freshness of its divinity. Coming in contact with apostles and apostolic men, they imbibed the doctrines of religion from their lips. They must have had less inclination for *writings*, not only because the latter were a more languid vehicle of public instruction, but because their calm perusal was not practicable. The activity of the times was unfavourable to the leisurely reading of books, even if these books had been generally circulated. The multiplication of copies too was a slow process; and therefore the great majority of the people, and even of the religious teachers, were mainly indebted to living

tradition for their knowledge of Christianity. Definite appeals to the apostolic writings should not be expected from men surrounded by these influences. The practical claims of the period hindered formal references. The Christian literature of the fathers in question was dependent on the oral teaching of apostles and apostolic men, much more than on the written books of the New Testament, as far as we may judge by that literature which has descended to us; for it is not so much occupied with combating cultivated heathens, deniers of the divine origin of Christianity, as with admonitions to the professors of the new religion. Their literature, in short, did not consist of the doctrinal and the didactic, but of the hortatory; for which latter purpose definite citations would have been less appropriate.

There is also a peculiarity about John's Gospel which renders it less likely to be quoted than the synoptical writings. Adapted as it is to meet the requirements of a higher Christian development, it would be more slowly connected with the evangelical history in the living consciousness of the catholic church, than with the external history of which the first three Gospels substantially consist. *They* at least would be soonest appealed to on behalf of the evangelical revelation in all cases where they were sufficient.

On a comprehensive view of all the relations of the period to which the apostolic fathers belong — of its wants and tendencies — of the representatives of its literature, as well as the nature of that literature itself, it is natural to expect few clear or immediate appeals to the fourth Gospel. Perhaps, too, on a minute examination of their writings, it will appear that they are not so barren of reference to the Gospel in question as has been represented. It may be ascertained that phraseology which is peculiarly John's, has been introduced into them. The source of various expressions, and still more of various conceptions, will probably be sought in the fourth Gospel. Passages and phrases of this character have been already adduced. When we look at them attentively, and consider their probable origin, the most natural supposition is that which assigns them to the evangelical history as *written* by John. It is *possible* to account for them on some other hypothesis; but probabilities lie in the opposite

direction. We cannot hesitate to believe that they were drawn from the fourth Gospel.

Let us proceed to notice the objections taken to the passages formerly quoted to prove the existence of John's Gospel from the apostolic age itself. The allusions were more or less indefinite, furnishing the sceptical critics with a plausible weapon, in proportion to the want of precision or verbal departure from the sacred document.

Lützelberger has endeavoured to invalidate the force of the passage in Ignatius' epistle to the Romans, in its applicability to the present question, by remarking that the figurative expressions, *heavenly bread* and *drink*, had long been current among the Jews. In proof of this assertion, he refers to Sirach (xv. 4), where it is alleged that λόγος is termed *bread* or *food* (ἄρτος); and to the *Essenes*, who represented the passover as *a heavenly meal.* But in Sirach, *wisdom* (σοφία), is simply said to feed man with the bread of understanding; while the fact that the passover was designated a heavenly meal by *some* of the Jews, is equally inapplicable to the point in question. The expressions, *heavenly food and drink*, are here *expressly identified with* the *flesh and blood of Christ;* and nothing approaching to that idea is found in the writings of the Jews.

Lützelberger further states, that Ignatius was not acquainted with written Gospels, on account of the increasing stress laid on the authority of bishops and presbyters as the depositaries of pure Christian doctrine in opposition to heretics, rather than on sacred books. If this consideration be of any weight against the existence of written Gospels in the time of Ignatius, it will apply with equal validity to the epistles of Paul, some of which at least were written before the last three Gospels and addressed to churches in Asia Minor, having been called forth by the circumstances of the churches themselves. The argument, if so it may be called, would militate equally against the authenticity of the Pauline epistles, since Ignatius expressly refers to none of them, with the exception of that to the Ephesians.

In regard to Polycarp, exception has also been made to his acquaintance with John's Gospel. Lützelberger, with the view of weakening the testimony adduced from the seventh chapter

of his epistle to the Philippians, remarks, that the idea of antichrist, as expressed in the first epistle of John, may have been a *watchword* or *shibboleth* of the orthodox church against the Docetae. Polycarp and the writer of the first epistle of John took it from a common source; but the one employed it independently of the other. But why is this watchword wanting in the Ignatian epistles, which abound in adverse references to Docetism. Here, if anywhere, the shibboleth in question would have been appropriate. But yet it is never mentioned. Bretschneider remarks, that the writer of the first epistle may have taken the expression from Polycarp. This is utterly improbable. The epistle of Polycarp is essentially dependent on other writings. It has no characteristic of originality. Its ideas and expressions are manifestly moulded after various books of the New Testament, particularly the Pauline epistles. It will always appear more natural to the impartial inquirer, to refer the words in question to the first epistle of John, especially when the subsequent context is considered where ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἔστι is put, as a positive expression of the negative ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστι used by John.

But a passage in Irenaeus has been adduced to prove that Polycarp had not the Gospel of John. In an epistle addressed to Florinus he writes: "I saw thee when I was yet a boy in the lower Asia with Polycarp. . . . . I remember the events of those times much better than those of more recent occurrence. As the studies of our youth, growing with our mind, unite with it so firmly, I can tell even the very place where the blessed Polycarp was accustomed to sit and discourse; and also his entrances, his walks, the complexion of his life, and the form of his body, and his conversations with the people, and his familiar intercourse with John, as he was accustomed to tell; as also his familiarity with those who had seen the Lord; how also he used to relate their discourses, and what things he had heard from them concerning the Lord; also concerning His miracles, His doctrine: all these were told by Polycarp, in consistency with the Holy Scriptures, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the doctrine of salvation. These things, by the mercy of God, and the opportunity then afforded me, I attentively heard, noting

them down, not on paper, but in my heart; and these same facts I am always in the habit, by the grace of God, of recalling faithfully to mind. And I can bear witness in the sight of God, that if that blessed and apostolic presbyter had heard any such thing as this, he would have exclaimed and stopped his ears[1]," etc. Here Irenaeus refers solely to what Polycarp had heard from the apostle, not to any thing which had been *written* by the latter, though this would have been far more likely to convince Florinus of his heretical sentiments, and to induce him to abandon them. But surely it was wiser in Polycarp to relate John's unpublished sayings, since they might not have been otherwise known, than to cite what his hearers might read for themselves in the Gospel. The former must have been doubly interesting to them, because they were perfectly new, and not committed to writing.

Bretschneider, and after him Schwegler, has adduced another argument to shew either that Polycarp was not acquainted with John's Gospel, or did not reckon it authentic.

When Polycarp visited Anicetus, bishop of Rome, about A. D. 162, and held a friendly conference with him respecting the passover, he maintained that the Asiatic churches were right in keeping the Christian festival in the evening after the *fourteenth* of Nisan simultaneously with the Jews, appealing in support of these sentiments to John and the other apostles. How then could Polycarp, it is asked, thus appeal to John, since the fourth Gospel expressly states that Jesus partook of the supper on the *thirteenth* of Nisan, and was crucified the fourteenth? He must either have cited John's authority falsely, which is not at all probable, or that apostle did not write the Gospel which makes an opposite statement to what Polycarp attributes to John.

This argument would be conclusive, if it could be proved that John's Gospel really contradicts the first three in making Jesus partake of the supper on the thirteenth of Nisan. But this cannot be demonstrated. We believe, on the contrary, that he and the synoptists agree in representing Christ to have kept the passover on the *fourteenth*, as has been already shewn in the remarks on Matthew.

Papias has also been discarded from the list of witnesses by

[1] Ap. Euseb. v. 20.

Credner and Zeller[m], though he was acquainted with the first epistle of John, and was probably not ignorant, on that account, of the Gospel written by the same apostle. The bishop himself expressly says, that he had carefully inquired what were the declarations of the apostles concerning Jesus, and found only two works of apostolic origin, viz., the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, and the Gospel of Mark. Hence it is inferred, that he could not have looked upon the Gospel of John as an authentic production, if he wrote A. D. 140.

The account which Eusebius gives of Papias, and the extracts from his λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις, do not warrant the above representation. It is true that the historian adduces nothing from the work of Papias relating to the Gospel of John; and it may appear strange that he has not done so, as it was consistent with his purpose to furnish early notices of all the books composing the New Testament canon. It is unwarrantable, however, to infer from the single fact of Eusebius giving no extracts from Papias' work, that it contained nothing relative to the fourth Gospel. Perhaps the ecclesiastical historian meant to furnish such traditions alone from the book of Papias, as had been received from the presbyter John. We may thus conclude, that Papias had heard nothing from John the presbyter concerning the origin of John's Gospel, else he would have inserted it in his book. Hence it may be admitted, without detriment to the canonical authority of that Gospel, that the Phrygian bishop said nothing of it in his λογ. κυρ. ἐξήγ. It is also probable that Papias wrote much earlier than A. D. 140—about A. D. 110—at which time the Gospel could not have been so extensively circulated as it must have been *thirty* years later. It can scarcely be supposed that one who knew the first epistle, could have been ignorant of the Gospel.

With regard to the passage quoted by Justin Martyr in his Apology, i. 61, from John iii. 3-5, the objections made to it by Credner and Lützelberger are frivolous. The former asserts, that had it been quoted from John, the characteristic ἀμὴν ἀμὴν at the commencement of it must also have been given; that ἀναγεννηθῆναι is put instead of γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν; that the phrase βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is unknown to John; and that the words

[m] Theologisch. Jahrbücher for 1845, Heft 4, p. 652, et seqq.

οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν, κ. τ. λ. are also in Matthew xviii. 3. The passage, it is true, is not an exact quotation. Justin quotes from memory; and therefore it was not unlikely that similar expressions of our Lord, related by different evangelists, should have been partially mingled together in his mind. But the clear basis of his words is indisputably to be looked for in John iii. 3-5. We admit that the introductory ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν does not refer to ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν, κ. τ. λ., the latter being rather an addition made by Justin himself; but the question is, *how* the father came to annex that clause to the preceding? Whence did he derive it? From any of the other Gospels? No. Was it the suggestion of his own mind? This is utterly improbable. Did Justin and the writer of the fourth Gospel draw it from the same source, viz. *the Gospel of the Hebrews?* There is not the slightest evidence to shew that either of them saw or used that document. Nor were the Clementine Homilies the source; for though they have in the quotation the words ἀναγεννηθῆτε and εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν as Justin, yet the following context ὕδατι ζῶντι εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς, υἱοῦ, καὶ πνεύματος, evincing a mixture of the passages John iv. 10 and Matth. xxviii. 19 (Hom. ii. 26), shews that the father drew it from no other source than the fourth Gospel. Justin adopts the language of Christ as his own, and appends it as such to the preceding clause. Lützelberger thinks that the doctrine of regeneration may have been taken from another source, for the Rabbins called a proselyte *one born anew.* Supposing however that the Jews did so, does not Justin affirm ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν? Here is the source of his description of regeneration.

Again, Bretschneider and Lützelberger have tried to invalidate the testimony to this Gospel afforded by the Valentinians. According to their representation, the gnostic character of the Gospel was so much allied to their own system, that they would most willingly use it. This observation would be of weight, if the *gnosis* of the Gospel were the same as that of the Valentinians, or even similar to it in its main features. The two however are very different. It even required most unnatural interpretations of the Gospel on the part of this sect to bring their peculiar tenets into harmony with it. The Gospel appears to have

been firmly established in the Catholic Church as an authoritative, canonical writing, else these heretics would not have taken great pains to educe their speculations from it, or at least to find support for them in its text. We know that their characteristic peculiarities of creed were not derived from the Gospel of John, but from a production which they set above all the sacred books—the *evangelium veritatis*. Why then should they have been solicitous about the agreement of their Gnosticism with the fourth Gospel, had not the latter been an authoritative book among Catholic Christians? It was of importance, in their view, to prove or corroborate their sentiments by means of an *apostolic* writing, or one at least which was commonly regarded as *apostolic*.

It is more difficult to shew that Marcion, the contemporary of Valentinus, Justin, and Polycarp, was acquainted with John's Gospel. Belonging as he did to Asia Minor, it is remarkable that he never mentions or alludes to it; although the opinion of the Catholic Church respecting the apostolic origin of it would lead us to infer that it must have been best known in the country where Marcion lived. While it is admitted that his followers made a partial use of the Gospel, there is an absence of evidence in favour of the fact that he himself employed it. The only Gospel he had was that of Luke modified, abridged, and adapted to his own views[n].

Two suppositions present themselves, and we must choose between them. Was he entirely ignorant of the existence of the Gospel? which is almost tantamount to the fact that it had not been written so early; Or, did he reject it? The truth of the former is maintained by Eichhorn, Gratz, Lützelberger, and others. Had he been acquainted with it, it is agreed that he would have preferred it to any other, as did the Gnostic sects generally; for he would have met with no passages in it contrary to his peculiar views; such as those representing heavenly feasts, at which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are present; no mention of Paradise as the seat of the blessed; no longing desire on the part of Jesus for the passover-meal; no allusions to Judaism. On the contrary, every thing would have accorded with his sentiments; and therefore

[n] See Norton on the Genuineness of the Gospels, vol. iii. note c, p. 49, et seqq. Cambridge edition, 1844.

instead of selecting Luke's Gospel, from which he was obliged to expunge many paragraphs, he would at once have chosen John's. The genius of the fourth was quite in harmony with his *gnosis*, because it presents Christianity in an aspect of spiritual, ideal universality, as contrasted with an external and partial Judaism. The prologue in particular, speaking as it does of the Logos, His appearance on earth, His introduction of grace and truth, in opposition to the legal system of Moses, must have been a welcome portion to Marcion. Here he would have been under no necessity of taking away the history of Jesus' birth and childhood; nor of cutting off a genealogy, and then reproducing an introduction. Here *the supernatural* belonging to the Son of God is made a prominent feature, which would have been exactly appropriate to his purpose. Besides, Tertullian, when combating his opinions, gives no examples of passages in John's writings rejected by Marcion, as he does in relation to Matthew's Gospel.

Such are the chief considerations urged as proof of Marcion's ignorance of John's Gospel.

It appears to us most probable, that this heretic rejected the Gospel. The only writings he admitted as canonical were ten epistles of Paul. The Gospel of Luke, from the connection of its author with his favourite apostle, he adopted partially, abridging and altering it in various ways. It is not difficult to account for his strong partiality in favour of Paul. The polemical tone against Judaism and Judaising Christianity so strongly impressed on his epistles, constituted the reason of that predilection. The Gospel of John could not have been so acceptable, because it contains no direct or palpable opposition to Judaism. Whatever phenomena favourable to the creed of this Gnostic the fourth Gospel may have presented, it exhibits at the same time many things which he must have rejected. The elements of his system are certainly inconsistent with various parts of the sacred book. The prologue itself would have been offensive in some things, such as the statement that all things were created by the Logos, and the Logos becoming incarnate. The allusion to the Old Testament in the 45th verse of the first chapter of John, and the account of Jesus' presence at the marriage-feast in Cana, could not have been acceptable. The Christ of Marcion's creed could

not have uttered such expressions as are put into the mouth of Jesus i. 47; iv. 22; v. 46; nor could he have received the title given him in i. 50. Thus the Gospel was by no means so favourable to Marcion's purpose as has been supposed by Eichhorn and others. While doctrinal prejudices led him to adopt the epistles of Paul, and the intimacy subsisting between Luke and the apostle of the Gentiles recommended the third Gospel also to his attention, there was a reason for rejecting the fourth, because the author of it stood in an ambiguous relation to Paul, being termed by the latter an apostle of the circumcision (Gal. ii. 9).

Irenaeus and Tertullian also state°, that Marcion knew the four Gospels, rejecting, among others, that of John. Hence he was acquainted with it, but denied its apostolic authority. He was too partial to the apostle Paul, to admit a work proceeding from the apostle John. He received it before forming his peculiar system; but subsequently discarded it as a Judaising production, ignorantly supposing that the pure doctrine of Christ was falsified in it. Eichhorn indeed rejects the testimony of these two fathers, calling them opponents of Marcion, and assuming that they attributed *to the founder* what was true only of *the sect*. But surely the fact that they combated Marcion's sentiments, cannot *of itself* invalidate their statement respecting his rejection of many New Testament books. There must be sufficient evidence to counterbalance their testimony. In the absence of an historic voice to the contrary, it is extremely arbitrary to throw aside their testimony as unworthy of credit.

In relation to the examples adduced by Marcion from Matthew's Gospel they are so few, that the omission of any citation from John must have been accidental. In short, we cannot doubt that Marcion himself admitted the Gospel of John at one time, though he afterwards rejected it. One passage in Tertullian implying thus much, is too clear to be readily set aside. According to this father, Marcion made use of Paul's statements respecting the apostles:—Ut non recto pede incedentes ad veritatem evangelii, and respecting pseudo-apostolos quosdam pervertentes evangelium Christi, ad destruendum statum *eorum evangeliorum*,

° Tertull. c. Marc. iv. 3, 4, 5, and Irenaeus adv. Haeres. i. 27, 2; iii. 2. The passages are given by De Wette in his Einleit. sec. 72, notes *d* and *e*.

quae propria et sub apostolorum nomine eduntur vel etiam apostolicorum, ut scilicet fidem, quam illis adimit, suo conferat. Porro etsi reprehensus est Petrus et Joannes et Jacobus, qui existimabantur columnae, manifesta causa est (Adv. Marc. vi. 3). Nor does Marcion appear to have denied at any time that John was the author of the fourth Gospel. When he appeared, the production was in current repute among Catholic Christians, by whom it was appealed to as authentic and authoritative. It had not just started suddenly into existence from some unknown individual, but it had been known in the church from the commencement of the second century, recognised as the work of the apostle John, and indisputably referred to both as sacred and authoritative. Whatever may be advanced by the Tübingen school against Marcion's early *adoption*, and his subsequent *rejection* of the book, it cannot be denied that he may be fairly used as an evidence of the fact, that the Gospel was in existence in the church in the first half of the second century; and that the church, looking on it as the production of an apostle, attributed an authority to its contents corresponding to its acknowledged authorship.

The desperateness of the cause undertaken by Baur and his school cannot be exemplified better, than in the treatment which the passage quoted from Tertullian receives from Zeller[p], whose attempt to invalidate Marcion's testimony is miserably impotent.

According to Origen[q], and the author of the Dialogue *De Recta in Deum Fide*, the disciples of Marcion, or such at least as they refer to, were acquainted with the fourth Gospel, and inserted passages from it in the *Evangelium Ponticum*.

An obscure passage in Irenaeus[r] has been thought by many to prove that the Alogi, the opponents of the Montanists, rejected the Gospel of John on account of the promise of the Paraclete it contains, for the purpose of depriving those enthusiastic Christians of appeal to that promise in attestation of the Paraclete's new revelations. If the Alogi be really intended in the passage, their rejection of the Gospel shews the currency it had obtained, and

[p] Theol. Jahrbücher for 1845, vol. iv. Heft 4. p. 630, et seqq.

[q] De Princip. ii. 4 and 5.

[r] Advers. Haeres. iii. 11. See the passage in Lücke's Einleit. to his Commentary on John, third edition, pp. 60, 61; and the remarks of Bleek in his Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik, pp. 207 - 211.

the estimation in which it was held both by the Montanists and the catholic church. It was in ecclesiastical repute in the places where the Montanists appeared; and their one-sided opponents saw no readier method of opposing their pretensions, than rejecting the document to which they chiefly appealed.

But whatever interpretation may be assigned to the words, we know from Epiphanius[s] that the Alogi did deny the Gospel's authenticity, assigning it to Cerinthus. This procedure was manifestly dictated by doctrinal motives; for the sect stumbled at the incarnation of the Logos in Christ. In justification of their sentiments respecting the Gospel, they referred to contradictions between it and the others, a task which would have been superfluous if the document had not been ecclesiastically recognised. In case the sect appeared soon after the Montanists, and in opposition to them, the mode in which they treated the Gospel *implies* that the Montanists received it.

Attempts have been made to invalidate the testimony of Irenaeus, on the ground of his omitting to adduce Polycarp's opinion respecting the fourth Gospel, and also his being necessitated to prove the number of the canonical Gospels to be *four*, by absurd analogies taken from the four winds, the cherubim, the divine covenant made with Adam, Noah, Moses, and Christ. Instead of at once appealing to Polycarp, at whose feet he had sat in his youth, and whose word would have proved the existence of no more than four canonical Gospels, he is obliged to have recourse to artificial explanations. We do not know, however, whether Irenaeus had ever heard Polycarp speak on that point. If he did not, it was impossible for him to quote the testimony of the revered preceptor to whom he had listened in his early years. Nor is it probable that Polycarp referred in his oral instructions frequently, or at all, to the writings which John had left. Such was not the practice of those who lived and conversed with the apostles. The doctrines and precepts of Christianity were received into their inmost souls with a living power, and were poured forth thence by the teachers of religion with a freshness inconsistent with formal appeals to written documents. Even in refuting opponents they did not make express or direct

[s] Advers. Haeres. li. 3.

references to writings. And then with regard to the analogies in question, Irenaeus does not adduce them for the purpose of proving for the first time that the number of the Gospels was neither more nor less than four, but to confirm the number historically handed down, by mystical comparisons. He proceeded on the ground of four being already recognised, to evince the naturalness of just so many. The considerations given by Irenaeus to establish the propriety of the number four, *imply* the general reception of four Gospels at that time by the church; but his object was not to *demonstrate* the authenticity of four only.

It has been thought, indeed, that in the epistle to Florinus there was a necessity on the part of Irenaeus to prove the Gospel's authenticity, because the title of that polemic letter addressed to his former friend, shews the latter to have embraced Marcionite views, and consequently to have believed that the Gospels were the spurious productions of Judaising Christians. And yet Irenaeus merely appeals to the *oral teaching* of Polycarp, and to what John himself *orally* taught.

In answer to this, it may be said of the title prefixed to the letter addressed to Florinus, that it by no means proves him to have been a follower of Marcion. Neither is there any reason for concluding that Florinus rejected the authenticity of our Gospel. Besides, even on the supposition that he *did* deny or doubt the apostolic origin of it, it cannot be legitimately inferred that Irenaeus was unable to demonstrate it historically, simply because he does not appeal to *the writings* of John and of Polycarp. Lützelberger's reasoning would be valid, if it could be shewn that an appeal to the fourth Gospel as an authentic, canonical document, and the citation of passages from it was considered by Irenaeus to be *the only*, or *the best* means of bringing conviction to the mind of Florinus. But this can never be demonstrated. On the contrary, the mode in which Irenaeus addresses him, reminding him of what he had heard from the aged disciple of John in the ardour of youthful emotion, was fitted to be more effectual than formal quotations.

It is vain to depreciate the value of Irenaeus' testimony on the ground of his youth at the time when he listened to Polycarp.

He styles himself *a boy* (παῖς); but that term neither means *a child* on the one hand, as Credner renders it, nor on the other can it be extended, with Dodwell, to the twenty-first year. He had arrived at an age capable of understanding, and in some degree appreciating the instructions of the venerable Polycarp.

In a word, all that Irenaeus has written directly or indirectly bearing on the Gospels, implies that the four which we now have were in his day current in the catholic church as authentic, authoritative, productions.

Among the early enemies of Christianity were Porphyry and Julian. The former attacked the book of Daniel with critical arguments, denying that it was written by the prophet himself. It appears however that he acknowledged the authenticity of John's Gospel; for he based a charge of fickleness against Jesus on the seventh chapter[t]. Surely he would not have refrained from attacking this book any more than Daniel, had he found a valid reason for doing so. Julian again blamed John as being the only one of the apostles who called Christ *God*, representing him as the Creator of heaven and earth[u].

In the beginning of the fifth century, Faustus attacked our Gospel, as we are informed by Augustine[x]. It is difficult however to learn from Augustine, whether Faustus rejected the four Gospels, alleging them not to have been written by apostles, but at a period after their death; or whether he merely rejected certain parts of the fourth. In stating the heretic's sentiments on this point, the African father is scarcely consistent, and certainly not clear. Whatever view of the subject be taken, it is manifest that Faustus' opinion of the New Testament books is entitled to no weight. It comes not in the shape of an argument, but of the arbitrary utterances of subjective caprice. The unanimous voice of ancient tradition cannot be weakened by Manichaean prejudices.

We have thus noticed the objections made to the external evidence in favour of this Gospel, especially by recent writers, such as Bretschneider, Lützelberger, Baur, and Schwegler, the last of whom follows for the most part his predecessor Lützel-

[t] Hieronym. contra Pelagian. [u] Cyrillus adv. Julian, lib. x. p. 327.
[x] Contra Faustum 32, 2, and 33, 3.

berger. And how impotent do these objections appear! How unlike the statements of men simply desirous of arriving at truth! If the bad cause they resolved to espouse did not appear desperate in their eyes, they have resorted at least to desperate weapons. Let them dwell as much as they will on the scantiness of definite information, or the absence of direct, irresistible testimony contained in peculiar passages in favour of the Gospel; let them insist on the nature of the common tradition held by the early church, as though it were compounded of the fabulous and the true; let them hold up to view the credulousness of the fathers generally, the suspicious fact that the Gnostics, particularly the Valentinians, were the first who distinctly employed the Gospel as an authentic production of John the apostle (a fact which can never be proved), all these considerations will fail to overthrow the claims of the book to an apostolic origin.

It must be admitted, that ideas and expressions characteristic of John the apostle are found in the early writings of Tatian, Justin, Celsus, and others. Whence then were they derived? Were they taken from sources long ago lost, out of which the Pseudo-John also drew his materials; or were they originally derived from a genuine apostolic Gospel, such as the catholic church has uniformly considered the fourth? To the former supposition there are serious obstacles. It is easy to conjure up common apocryphal sources that may serve to account for the similarity between modes of thought and expression found in the early fathers and in the fourth Gospel; but their *existence* must always be a pure figment. Besides, the relation of the oldest Christian literature to the apostolic, shews that the former must have arisen *out of* the latter. There are a freshness and pregnancy in the one which stamp a character of originality upon it; while *the manifold application* of ideas and sentiments marks *a derivative* form. If *the apostolic* literature came first, not merely as prior but giving origin to patristic Christian literature, it exercised in a natural manner the power which it did undoubtedly exert over contemporary and succeeding Christians. It became interwoven with current modes of thought and utterance. It was a fundamental element in the development of the church's spiritual life. But if *apocryphal* sources formed

the common fountain whence early Christian writers and the alleged John drew their materials, the question is encumbered with great perplexity. When Theophilus of Antioch and Irenaeus bear express testimony to the authenticity of the fourth Gospel, how did they arrive at that conclusion? They followed tradition; but that tradition must have been firmly rooted and widely spread in their day, an idea inconsistent with the fact, that the Gospel was first written in the second century. The very circumstance, that Irenaeus brings forward no definite historical reasons for believing the fourth Gospel to be a work of John's, so far from favouring the sceptical opponents of revelation, confirms the opposite opinion. It was the prevalent belief of the catholic church; and he had no reason for investigating the grounds of it with microscopic criticism. Many of the heretics he combated did not deny the Gospel to be the production of John the apostle; the catholic church universally received the tradition; and he himself agreed with it. The current tradition *may indeed have been* incorrect; Irenaeus *may have been* mistaken in coinciding with it; but *the probabilities* lie wholly in the other direction.

It is curious to see men insisting so much on the want of definite quotation up to the latter half of the second century, when they ought to have perceived that this was no other than the natural course of procedure in regard to the apostolic writings. The greater the lapse of time after their original composition, the more stress would be laid on the external exactness of the expressions contained in them. Immediately after their first appearance, they would be applied with greater freedom out of the fulness of the heart and memory. Gradually and subsequently would they begin to be cited with definiteness, and with the appended name of the writer.

When those who date the origin of our Gospel in the second century venture to specify the precise time or nearly so at which it appeared, it is easy to demonstrate the impossibility of its immediate and general reception as a sacred book by the catholic church. On their hypothesis it started, as if by a miracle, into common use and authority. There was none to detect or expose the fraud. Men who had been John's disciples,

or who had conversed with him or his disciples, did not venture to raise their voice against the supposititious work. All were deceived, or disgracefully silent respecting the imposture. They discarded other apocryphal productions; they would not admit other spurious Gospels, while they unhesitatingly adopted *this*. Whoever can believe the truth of such a representation is far more credulous than the early Christians, whose easy faith forms an object of his contempt.

We proceed to consider objections to the Gospel's authenticity derived from itself; or the internal phenomena supposed to militate against its apostolic origin. They are mainly the following:—

I. The high degree of culture and spiritual perception exhibited in the document, is inconsistent with the mental character of the person named John described in the Synoptists and Pauline epistles — of that John who was originally a fisherman of Galilee. It is affirmed, that the doctrines of the Logos and Trinity there unfolded require a considerable period of time for their development, and could not have been excogitated by one who is described in the three Gospels as a Jewish-Christian. Who could expect from a simple unlettered fisherman, such Alexandrian culture, such philosophico-theological speculation and Grecian purity of language, as appear in the fourth Gospel? The epistles of Paul intimate not obscurely, that John was obstinate in his Jewish-Christian notions; that he was adverse to Paul's development of liberal Christianity, no less than Peter and James; while the author of our Gospel evinces a spiritual and comprehensive view of the new religion similar to Paul's. Such is an abstract of points urged by Weisse, Schwegler, Lützelberger, Baur, and others.

The objection, however, scarcely deserves distinct mention, much less a formal refutation, for it is based on a view of the apostle's mind and sentiments, exaggerated, erroneous, and false.

II. There is a want of definiteness and accuracy, of clearness and vividness in the Gospel. There are, besides, geographical and archaeological mistakes, with the insertion of traditional reminis-

cences in improper places. From these phenomena the conclusion is drawn, that the writer always lived at a distance, of place and time, from the scene of the events narrated.

III. Another group of objections, on which much stress has been laid, is borrowed from the relation of the fourth Gospel to the first three. Many striking diversities appear between it and them, which are employed as an argument against its authenticity. These differences may be classed under the following heads:—

(*a*) Diversity in regard to the scene and duration of Jesus' public ministry.

(*b*) That relating to the description of His person.

(*c*) That which belongs to the discourses He uttered.

There are certain facts and phenomena requiring attention from those who would successfully reply to these objections, which we would briefly notice before descending to particulars.

It should be considered, that John was at first a disciple of John the Baptist whose energy of character and emphatic admonitions appear to have given a deep and permanent direction to the spirit of the youthful pupil. That spirit, young, fiery, susceptible, was awakened to a new consciousness by the earnest ministry of the rough prophet of the wilderness. When Jesus entered on his public career, John immediately attached himself to the greater prophet pointed out by the Baptist. Here a certain pliancy of mind was manifested in connection with One who was perfectly fitted to attract to himself the higher excellencies of humanity. At this time, the disciple could scarcely have been more than twenty years of age. That he had been without education at home is improbable, when the circumstances of his father, and especially the character of his mother are considered. Henceforward the pupil shared the intimate friendship of the Master. He was privileged to lean on His bosom. He hung on His lips with intenser interest than any of the apostles, and reflected more of His disposition. The union of spirit between them was closer than that of the other disciples. In John the image of Jesus was mirrored to a much greater degree than in them. His mental temperament, naturally perhaps similar, was

largely moulded after that of the Master. Nor was the mind, though thus susceptible, destitute of self-dependence or originality. The sceptical critics themselves admit that it was of an original cast, not of that passive and pliant character which yields acquiescingly to the influence of circumstances as they arise. In short it was both susceptible and reflective, tinged with a tendency to mysticism, and turned towards the unseen world away from practical life.

If the habitudes and intimacies of the apostle were such, it is natural to suppose that certain acts and discourses of Jesus would be selected by him—those which sank deeply into his spirit, and moulded it most largely. It should also be observed, that John wrote a considerable time after the destruction of Jerusalem, in Asia Minor, and was well acquainted with the current tradition embodied in other Gospels, so that he would probably avoid a mere repetition of the common evangelical materials, and introduce topics comparatively new. If his Gospel were intended to be a kind of supplement to the others, it is natural to find an important difference between it and the preceding. The object too which he had in view; the wants of those for whom he wrote in the first instance, in connection with his own intellectual and moral temperament, would lead the evangelist to select such portions of the evangelical tradition as accorded with these circumstances. Hence he chose materials not yet developed, though not absolutely or essentially new.

Nor should *the agreement* between the synoptists and John be overlooked. The peculiar doctrines developed in our Gospel refer to Christ's mysterious relation to the Father, His mystical union with believers, the promise of the Paraclete, and the great prominence assigned to Love. And yet these peculiarities lie in germ in the writings of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, while they are clearly taught in the Pauline epistles. Christ's mystical relation to the Father seems to have made the most vivid impression on John's mind—a mind with which it had many points of contact. The idea of this relationship, and the inherent dignity of Jesus as the Son of God, are also found in Matt. xi. 27; and in such passages as ix. 14, et seqq.; xvi. 16, et seq.; xxi. 37; xxii. 41, et seq.; xxv. 31, et seq.; xxvi. 64; xxviii. 18. The mystical union

of Christ with believers is essentially implied in the words of Matt. xxviii. 20. Nor is the promise of the Paraclete wholly unknown to the other evangelists; as may be seen from Luke xxiv. 49. The sermon on the Mount given both by Matthew and Luke, shews that the doctrine of love had been already taught. It is unnecessary to allude to particular passages in Paul's epistles, where the same doctrines are promulgated. The epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians in particular, exhibit them in perfect harmony with the representations of John. Whether the apostle of the Gentiles received them from traditional reports of Jesus' sayings, or from immediate divine influence on his own mind, the fact that his epistles contain them would dispose us to look upon the peculiarities of John's Gospel as authentic and genuine.

And then the parts of the Gospel that bear a practical aspect similar to that of the others, ought not to be neglected. Expressions breathing the same practical spirit as the synoptists may be easily found, as vii. 17; xiii. 12 et seqq. 34 et seqq.; xiv. 21; xv. 7-14. When it is asserted with one-sided exaggeration that the tone of the fourth Gospel is an echo of the speculative theosophy of the Alexandrian school, proceeding from a cultivated Gentile of Asia Minor, these portions may be adduced to modify, if not to refute that view. We find too, not only entire narratives, but also individual expressions of Jesus that agree with those of the preceding Gospels, even *verbally* to some extent. Examples are presented in xii. 8, comp. Matt. xxvi. 11; xii. 25, comp. Matt. x. 39; xiii. 16, and xv. 20, comp. Matt. x. 24; xiii. 20, comp. Matt. x. 40; xiv. 31, comp. Matt. xxvi. 46; ii. 19, comp. Matt. xxvi. 61, and Mark xiv. 58.

In short, there is nothing taught in the Gospel of John, whose parallel cannot be found either in the synoptical Gospels, or the epistles of the New Testament. No doctrine, principle, or duty is found there, which cannot be discovered in other portions of the sacred canon. Surely this fact speaks in favour of the former's authenticity. The ideas peculiar to our evangelist had not been evolved in the period at which the first three Gospels appeared, because it was then the rudimental age of Christianity; but the interval between them and the fourth Gospel justifies and confirms

the naturalness of their development near the close of the first century.

Let us now look at the promise given in xiv. 26, particularly: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." These words, though found in our Gospel alone, cannot be arbitrarily rejected as unauthentic. It is manifest from them, that a divine influence was imparted to aid the memory of the apostles. Absolute literality, the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus' discourses we have not, because they were delivered in Aramaean. Then as to *the degree* in which the original words are presented by the apostle John, there may be diversity of opinion. We do not believe that the true sense of the promise implies the exertion of a mechanical inspiration on the minds of the apostles, by virtue of which they were able to recall to their recollection the identical terms used by Jesus on every occasion, in their precise relations and connection. The meaning rather is, that the Spirit should be given so largely as to bring back to their thoughts the sayings of Jesus, with all the power of a living consciousness. *Absolute literal* fidelity is neither expressed nor implied in the promise. It can hardly be supposed indeed that the apostles should have been able to reproduce the larger discourses of their Master, in their exactest form and precise literality, after the lapse of many years, without the aid of a magical miraculousness superseding the ordinary laws of human thought. But these discourses were to be brought before their spirits with deep, distinct, perfect individuality, so that the apostles, guarded from mistake, could state them with substantial fidelity after the ascent of their Lord. Want of literality in reproducing them may to a certain extent be fairly conceded to the negative critics, without endangering their authenticity or credibility. Doubtless their form received much of its colouring from the mind of John himself. In regard to style, a freedom which the careful observer cannot mistake, appears in their reproduction. *How far* the characteristic peculiarities of the writer's mind influenced the form of the larger discourses, it is impossible to discover. But it is tolerably certain, that the thing mainly affected by them was *the form*, not *the*

substance; the style rather than the *thoughts.* And yet it cannot be supposed that *leading terms* expressive of fundamental ideas and equivalent to technical words, proceeded from John's own reflection; or that the greater portion of the peculiar phraseology should be set to his account. There are many words of cardinal import, symbolising ideas connected with mystical relations, which must be attributed to the great Teacher himself. There is a mellowness, if we may so speak, about the form of the thoughts —a melting peculiarity—which may be fairly attributed to the mental temperament of the writer; while the ideas themselves so embodied do not belong to him. But while affirming that John has thus reproduced the discourses of Jesus, impressing them with a considerable portion of their present form out of his own spirit, we do not furnish any advantage to the opponents of the Gospel; for it must still be true that all the utterances made a deep impression on his mind, giving to it the ideas which formed its true starting-point, as well as its highest aliment. Even many of the shapes in which they developed themselves were original. For though that mind was of an independent cast, it is impossible not to see that the profound truths uttered by Christ, many of them bordering on the region of the mysterious, must have sunk into the soul of the disciple in their original forms of presentation. Doubtless he turned them over repeatedly in his bosom, musing upon them by day and by night, the Spirit in the meantime aiding his recollection; yet it would require a high degree of intellectual strength and originality wholly to burst away from the very forms of the ideas as they penetrated the susceptible spirit of the disciple at first. That there was nothing allied to the impossible in recollecting the lengthened discourses, will be admitted by such as consider the instances of memory which sometimes occur. Thus when a sermon has been the means of awakening new life within, it has been minutely remembered in subsequent years, adhering to the living consciousness with a tenacity truly astonishing. The example of Irenaeus is to the purpose. Addressing Florinus, he says: "I saw thee when I was yet a boy, in the lower Asia, with Polycarp, etc. I remember the events of those times much better than those of more recent occurrence. As the studies of our youth

growing with our minds unite with it so firmly, I can tell also the very place where the blessed Polycarp was accustomed to sit and discourse; and also his entrances, his walks, the complexion of his life, and the form of his body, and his conversations with the people, and his familiar intercourse with John, as he was accustomed to tell, as also his familiarity with those who had seen the Lord. How also he used to relate their discourses, and what things he had heard from them concerning the Lord. Also concerning his miracles, his doctrine; all these were told by Polycarp in consistency with the Holy Scriptures, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the doctrine of salvation. These things by the mercy of God, and the opportunity then afforded me I attentively heard, noting them down not on paper, but in my heart; and these same facts I am always in the habit, by the grace of God, of recalling faithfully to mind."

These general remarks rightly applied, will serve to neutralise the force of various exaggerated statements and one-sided objections advanced against the Gospel by recent writers. Let us now look at the objections a little more particularly in the order of statement.

I. The doctrine of the Logos in John's Gospel has been frequently traced to Philo. It is thus an emanation of the Alexandrian school. The writer living in Ephesus, where the current theosophy combined various philosophical and religious elements, and coming in daily contact with educated Gentiles, learned that type of the Logos-doctrine which was peculiar to Alexandria and developed in the writings of Philo. Thus the speculative spirit of the Alexandrian school is supposed to be manifested in the Gospel, at least in regard to this topic. The Logos-doctrine came into Asia Minor from Alexandria, where it was unfolded by Philo, who obtained it mainly from Plato.

The essential idea involved in the Logos-doctrine of John may be traced even to the most ancient of the Old Testament books. We read there of *the angel of Jehovah* or *of God*, whose relation to *Jehovah* or *Elohim* is similar to that of the Logos to God the Father. The idea afterwards appears in the חכמות of the book of

Proverbs, then in the book of Sirach, afterwards in the book of Wisdom, and next in the oldest Targums. It is obvious that the λόγος of our Gospel corresponds to the *σοφία* of Sirach, and the מימרא דיהוה of the Targums. Thus John's doctrine of the Logos may be traced up through the Jewish paraphrases to the book of Proverbs, and even to that of Genesis. It appears indeed with some modification and diversity in the Proverbs, Sirach, and Wisdom; yet the fundamental idea is the same.

But it has been affirmed, that the Alexandrian Gnosis influenced and affected the Palestinian theology. The alleged fact, however, cannot be rendered probable. Gfrörer's proof of it is by no means valid or conclusive[y]. We find, on the contrary, an uninterrupted manifestation of the Logos-doctrine in Palestine down to the latest Targums, *independently* of the Alexandrian school; so that John, born and educated as a Palestinian, while the current Targumist theology contained the Logos doctrine, could afterwards incorporate that doctrine into his Gospel.

On the other hand, Philo's view of the Logos is different from John's, being borrowed partly from the Hebrew theology, and partly from Plato. It is virtually a compound of both. It is of no importance to inquire whether John took *the term* λόγος from Philo, or translated it from the Targumist word מימרא. He may probably have derived it indirectly from the former. But that he obtained *the doctrine* or *the main idea* implied by the term, either directly or indirectly from Philo as representative of the Alexandrian school, cannot be shewn.

It must not be supposed that the Targumist theology presented *all* that John has incorporated into his Gospel respecting this point. The pre-existence of the Logos and his hypostatical relation to the Father are found indeed in the Old Testament; but it was the converse held by the disciple with Jesus—the impression made on his mind by the entire manifestation of that wonderful person and his sublime doctrine—which first led him to identify the Logos with the Messiah; and as he discovered in Jesus the long predicted Messiah, so did he find in Him the Logos. Thus *the peculiarity* of the Logos-doctrine, as it appears in our Gospel,

[y] Jahrhundert des Heiles, i. 316, et seqq.

was the development of *Christianity itself.* The *general idea* and *terminology* had long been a current part of the Jewish theology; but the express identification of the Logos with Messiah, and with Jesus as the Messiah, is unfolded by the disciple in consequence of the Master's teaching. A divine influence exerted on the reflective mind of the evangelist, aided it in arriving at this conclusion—a conclusion founded on all he saw, and heard, and witnessed of Jesus—that the Logos was none other than Jesus himself *hypostatically* related to the Father. In Philo, the Logos continues to be a *supramundane* conscious existence. He is not *manifested*, as in John's Gospel. Hence there is an important difference between the doctrine of both[2].

Thus it is not at all necessary to trace John's Logos-doctrine to the theosophic system of Alexandria; nor is it likely to have come from that quarter. The Palestinian theology presented all the points of contact fitted for having attached to them what was peculiarly *Christian* in the evangelist's view of the subject. Had the doctrine in question come to the writer from schools of learning or philosophy, it would doubtless have assumed a scientific and abstract form. It is improperly called an exhibition of philosophical speculation. We may with truth affirm, that there is little of speculative theology in John's writings. They exhibit the results of reflection on subjects the highest and most interesting to which the human mind can be directed; and it may be that the writer's converse with cultivated minds in Asia Minor, and the influences by which he was there surrounded, had some effect on the form and terminology of several leading ideas developed in the Gospel. But it is a groundless assumption that he borrowed his materials from the region of speculative Egyptian Gnosis, or that the culture of Asia Minor and Alexandria had any other influence on his manner of writing than what was inconsiderable. It is the *Palestinian*, not the *Alexandrian* type of the Logos doctrine which his Gospel presents. That his doctrine of the incarnate Logos was the later development of a subsequent period—the result of a far higher reflection than was reached during the apostolic age—is not supported by the New Testament. On the contrary, the Christology of John is identical, in its main features, with that of

[2] See Frommann's Johanneische Lehrbegriff, p. 141, et seqq.

Paul, as appears from the following passages:—1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 15, 16; Heb. i. 2, 3[a].

When the sceptical critics speak of John as being a stiff, obstinate, Jewish-Christian apostle, they *caricature*, but do not *describe* him. He had no sympathy with the Judaisers who set themselves in opposition to Paul. He was not at the head of any party; nor was he claimed as a leader by any sect of similar sentiments with the Judaisers. It is true, that along with Peter and James he accommodated himself so far to Jewish partialities as to observe legal customs in a Jewish land; but Paul himself prudently followed a similar procedure where principle was not involved. Neither they nor the apostle of the Gentiles adhered to Jewish observances as *necessary to salvation.* Hence the passage in Gal. ii. 12 has been grievously distorted by Weisse, Lützelberger, and Baur, for the purpose of presenting John in such a light as to render his authorship of the fourth Gospel highly improbable. In conjunction with Peter and James there mentioned, it is affirmed that he had no idea of a commission to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles; that all, except Paul, entertained a narrow view of the relation of heathenism to Christianity, while they certainly threw no obstacle in the way of Paul's labouring among the Gentiles. Such a view on the part of John presents, it is said, a marked contrast to the spirit and tendency of the Gospel commonly attributed to him. He could have had no idea of the Gentiles' admission into the kingdom of Messiah; neither could he have introduced into his Gospel a passage like that in John xii. 20, where Hellenists were desirous to be instructed by Jesus, and the latter was willing to receive them—a passage irreconcilable with the words of Gal. ii. 7-12.

Were it at all necessary, it might be shewn from the Acts of the Apostles and Peter's own epistles, that Peter and James were not such narrow-minded Jewish-Christians as is represented. But this is not now required. John is simply named along with them, as one of those who were *reputed to be pillars* or *heads* of the church at Jerusalem. And it is affirmed of the three, that "when they perceived the grace that was given unto me [Paul], they gave to me and Barnabas the right-hand of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen,

[a] See Frommann's Johanneische Lehrbegriff, p. 144 et seqq.; p. 517 et seqq.

and they unto the circumcision." Where now is the discrepancy between this statement and that introduced into the Gospel, viz., that certain Hellenists, probably *proselytes of the gate*, were desirous to see Jesus? The fact that the apostles maintained a certain conformity to the Jewish law for a considerable time, does not imply on their part so imperfect a perception of the universal spirit pervading the Gospel as some endeavour to shew. They prudently adapted their conduct, as far as the conservation of principle would allow, to the weakness and prejudices of those around them, without evincing a misapprehension of the relation of Christianity to paganism or to Judaism.

We account then for the culture of mind, the elevated and comprehensive views of Christianity contained in the Gospel, the conceptions of Deity and the relations of the Godhead exhibited in it, its entire Christology, as well as the character of the Greek diction, which, with all absence of artificiality in the construction of periods and its comparative purity, still bears the Hebrew colouring of a Palestinian Jew, to the intimate connection of the apostle with Jesus from an early age, the spiritual influences continually exerted on his susceptible spirit, and to his long residence in Asia Minor—a region of Grecian cultivation—the seat of philosophical men to whom the Greek language was vernacular. He was no unimprovable, stubborn, Jewish-Christian apostle, opposed to the tendencies of the Pauline theology. Nurtured amid the Palestinian theology, and certainly not without education in his early years, his habits of reflection associated the spiritual tendencies of the expiring dispensation with Jesus the Author of the new.

II. The frequent want of definiteness and accuracy of clearness and vividness in the Gospel. There are, besides, geographical and archaeological mistakes, with the insertion of traditional reminiscences in improper places. From these phenomena the conclusion is drawn, that the writer always lived at a distance of place and time from the scene of the events narrated.

As an example of vagueness, the observation that *the Jews* (*οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*) persecuted Jesus, or desired to put him to death, v. 16, 18; vii. 1, 19, 25; viii. 37, 40; xi. 8 is adduced. In con-

formity with this indefiniteness, the writer appears to stand in a relation foreign to the Jewish people, as though he occupied a position distant from their religion and customs, ii. 6, 13; v. 1; vi. 4; vii. 2; xi. 49; xix. 40. Even Jesus himself is described as occupying the same foreign position, and speaks accordingly of the Mosaic law as something with which he had no concern, viii. 17; x. 34; xv. 25.

An obscure, indistinct representation of events is found in ii. 3-5; xi. 4, 6; xii. 23.

Geographical and archaeological difficulties appear in i. 28; iii. 23; iv. 5, 7; ix. 7; xviii. 1; xi. 49; xviii. 13.

The traditional reminiscences inserted in improper places are, iv. 44; xiii. 20; xiv. 31.

Hence it is inferred, that the author of the Gospel was a Gentile-Christian, who lived subsequently to the apostolic age.

In reply to this group of objections, we shall waive allusion to *the general* characteristics of the Gospel, which are the very opposite of vagueness and obscurity. *The prevailing* manner of the writer is not deficient in definiteness or clearness. But we remark, that the author of the Gospel is here subjected to an unfair test. He is expected to be a regular, scientific historian, disposing his materials with all the ability and skill of those masters in historical composition who write as much with a view of immortality, as to instruct mankind. Such treatment evinces a total misapprehension of the evangelists. They were *religious* annalists. They were prompted to record certain events, and to relate certain discourses, with a *religious* purpose. In their view, every thing was subordinate to the great end of spiritual enlightenment. Minute points of history and geography were of very inferior interest, and were only noticed so far as was necessary to the unity and propriety of the greater theme on which they were intent. It is therefore unreasonable to look for minute exactness in those minor circumstances which have a *remote* connection with the religiousness of their subject. They should be judged as *popular* authors, writing for the instruction of mankind in general, and viewing events in the light in which they were fitted to impress the hearts of readers with the character and claims of Jesus as the Messiah. In establishing the Messiahship of their

Divine Master, they wrote to persuade and convince *the multitude*, the theme having an interest for all. Of human fame they were regardless. They had no eye to the criticism of the few. They did not think of artificial distinctions in writing. Regarding them as popular chroniclers, who were led to put together memorials of Jesus on earth, and to whom *the religious aspect* of facts was the chief point of importance, we should not scan minute points remotely bearing on their leading theme, with the microscopic eye of modern criticism.

The charge of vagueness is frivolous. When we consider the country where John wrote, the Gentile readers for whom his Gospel was intended in the first instance, the object he had in view, the appearance of his Gospel after the other three, and the dissolution of the Jewish nation, it will be seen that the general expression *the Jews* was sufficiently applicable to his purpose. As a popular appellation, it was suited to the Gentile believers for whom he wrote, characterising the body of the Jewish people contrasted with the Gentiles.

Strictly speaking, we read in the synoptists of disputations between the Sanhedrim, or individual Jews, and Jesus. It was not so much the mass of the people as their rulers who set themselves in opposition to him. But the writer's object was to depict the course and issue of the contest maintained by Jesus with the enemies of His person and work; and hence it was of no moment to specify *the individual opponents* with whom he came into conflict. He could speak with perfect propriety of the enmity exhibited towards the Great Teacher by the chiefs and many of the people as the enmity *of the Jews in general*, both because they fairly represented the spirit of the nation, and because the same hostility continued to be directed against the followers of the ascended Master.

There is evidence in the Gospel itself to shew, that the writer was a Jew by birth. This is fairly deducible from the fact of his acquaintance with the Old Testament in the original, since several of his quotations are freely translated from it, instead of being borrowed from the Septuagint.

That the writer did not appear at a much later than the apostolic period in the character of a Gentile-Christian viewing

Christianity as *antagonistic* to Judaism is probable, from the mode in which he repeatedly notices the sacred books of Judaism as referring to Christ, and receiving their full meaning in His history. See for example, ii. 17; xii. 14 seqq., 38, 39; xix. 24, 28, 36, 37. So also in the discourses of Jesus, xiii. 18; xv. 25; xvii. 12. A comparison of these passages with similar ones in the Gospel of Matthew, who being himself a Jewish-Christian wrote especially for such, will shew the writer of our Gospel to have been a native of Palestine.

It accords with this view to find the writer speaking of Jesus repeatedly going up to Jerusalem to keep the feasts; and noticing the fact as not unimportant, that certain Hellenists, who wished to see Jesus, had gone up to worship at Jerusalem (xii. 20). In like manner, the evangelist describes the Samaritan woman in her conversation with Jesus as calling the unknown Messiah *a Jew*, and the Messiah himself informing her that *salvation is of the Jews*. Does not the writer also intimate, that he was the disciple who was known to the high priest, and an eye-witness of the transactions recorded in the evangelical history?

It cannot for a moment be rendered probable, that the author, and Jesus himself, stood in a foreign relation to the Jewish nation. On the contrary, when we consider the circumstances in which John wrote, his language is in perfect accordance with the orthodox view.

In one respect, it is perfectly correct to say, that John was alienated from the Jewish nation. How could it be otherwise with regard to his views and feelings? He had lived for thirty years on Gentile ground—Jerusalem had been destroyed—her polity had come to an end—the nation, as such, belonged to a bygone age. Hence the distance at which the sentiments and heart of the apostle must have been from those who had brought signal destruction on themselves and their country by crucifying the Redeemer of the world—those too from whom John himself and his fellow-Christians had experienced continued opposition. In such passages as viii. 17; x. 34; xv. 25, the mode of expression is emphatic. Jesus, in reasoning with the Jews and confuting opponents, appealed to their own law—that very law which they accused Him of breaking. What could be more natural or

expressive than the phrase *your* law — that standard of which they boasted so much, and appealed to on all occasions? But the idea of *His* being excluded by this language from adherence to that law is wholly preposterous. He was not independent of the document to which he refers, in the sense of independence contended for by the critics who urge the objection in question. Parallels might be readily adduced from many languages. When Burke, for example, in his speech on American taxation (19th April, 1774), said of the House of Commons, "Like all great public collections of men, *you* possess a marked love of virtue and an abhorrence of vice," he was himself a member of the House.

The next particular stated in the objection is equally irrelevant. In the three passages ii. 3-5; xi. 4, 6; xii. 23, it may be conceded that some points are obscure, without affecting the authenticity of the entire document in which they occur. The narratives alluded to are brief. There is some uncertainty as to the exact meaning intended. But it is unfair to conclude, that an apostle was not the writer, because we may not be able to remove the little difficulties inherent in the passages. The principle in question might be applied to the Gospel of Matthew with ruinous effect. Is it not rash to charge our ignorance of circumstances to the account of the evangelist? Our incompetency to interpret every thing with perfect satisfaction, should not be turned against the sacred book.

We come now to the *geographical* and *archaeological* difficulties. In i. 28, a Bethany at Jordan is spoken of which probably had no existence. The topographical mistake points to some other than a native of Palestine.

In this objection it is assumed, that *Bethany* is the true reading, not *Bethabara*. Accordingly Griesbach and Lachmann have taken the former into the text. We learn too from Origen, that he found *Bethany* in almost all the MSS. of his day, but that he corrected the appellation and read *Bethabara*. Hence it appears that Bethany is undoubtedly the oldest reading; whether it be *the original one* is uncertain, though it is most probable. Some understand *the Bethany near Jerusalem;* but that is impossible in the

present passage, since the words "beyond Jordan, where John was baptising," seem added on purpose to distinguish *this* Bethany from the well-known village of the same name[b]. What prevents us from supposing that there was another Bethany besides that in the vicinity of Jerusalem, which had two names at different times? The place was east of the Jordan.

"And John also was baptising in Aenon near to Salim; because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptised" (iii. 23). Here there is no real difficulty. Aenon lay near the borders of Judea and Samaria, but probably belonged to *the latter;* and if Jerome describes its situation so as to fix it in Samaria, we need not be anxious to maintain *the minute accuracy* of his description.

"There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water: Jesus saith unto her, Give me to drink" (iv. 7). Here *Σαμαρεία* cannot denote *the city of* Samaria, which was at two hours' distance and called *Sebaste;* but *the province* of Samaria. Hence, although it be more natural in the view of Bretschneider to refer. *ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας* to *ἔρχεται*, yet we must consistently explain *ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας* as equivalent to *Σαμαρεῖτις; a woman belonging to Samaria.*

"Then cometh He to a city of Samaria, which is called Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph" (iv. 5). Here the appellation *Συχάρ* appears instead of *Συχέμ*, as on all other occasions. Different conjectures have been proposed to explain the unusual name. Probably it was merely an accidental corruption of the ancient designation, liquid letters being frequently changed into others in pronunciation.

"And said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam (which is by interpretation, Sent). He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing" (ix. 7). "The narrator," says Strauss, "interprets the name of the pool Silòam, by the Greek *ἀπεσταλμένος* (v. 7); a false explanation, for one who is sent is called שְׁלוּחַ, whereas שִׁלֹחַ, according to the most probable interpretation, signifies *a waterfall.* The evangelist however chose the above interpretation, because he sought for some significant relation between the name of the pool and the sending thither of the

[b] See Gfrörer's die Heilige Sage, Zweiter Theil, p. 279, et seqq.

blind man, and thus seems to have imagined, that the pool had, by a special Providence, received the name of *Sent*, because at a future time the Messiah, as a manifestation of his glory, was to send thither a blind man. Now we grant that an apostle might give a grammatically incorrect explanation, in so far as he is not held to be inspired, and that even a native of Palestine might mistake the etymology of Hebrew words, as the Old Testament itself shews; nevertheless, such a play upon words looks more like the laboured attempt of a writer remote from the event, than of an eye-witness. The eye-witness would have had enough of important matters in the miracle which he had beheld, and the conversation to which he had listened; only a remote narrator could fall into the triviality of trying to extort a significant meaning from the smallest accessory circumstance[a]."

The Hebrew verbal שִׁילוֹחַ corresponds to the Greek Σιλωὰμ, but this, it is affirmed, can only mean *a gush* or *effusion of water*. If indeed the Hebrew word be simply an *abstract infinitive form*, then it cannot be otherwise rendered than by *missio*, ἀποστολὴ, *the sending forth* or *effusion* of water, as Gesenius explains it. But it may also be a participle with a passive signification, such as אָיוֹב *hated*, יָלוֹד *born*[b]. This is allowed by Hitzig[c], Tholuck[d], Wilke[e], De Wette[f], and others. In the latter case it is equivalent to *sent*. What then is the meaning of appending the interpretation ἀπεσταλμένος? Is it a mere etymological gloss, as Olshausen thinks? That is improbable. The name was given to the fountain with prospective reference to the sending of the blind man to it. There was something providential in it. Who shall venture without presumption to pronounce it unworthy of Deity to have effected that arrangement providentially? The fountain obtained an appellation which, in the view of the person or persons so styling it, related to the *gushing forth* of water, but was also by a singular coincidence not accidental, to mark a miracle performed by the Messiah. Is this a play on words, or a triviality not befitting an apostle's notice? There

[a] English translation of Strauss, vol. ii. pp. 303, 304.
[b] See Gesenius' Lehrgebäude, § 120, pp. 490, 491.
[c] Commentar zu Jesaias, p. 79.
[d] Beiträge zur Spracherklärung des N. T. p. 125, et seqq.
[e] S. V. Σιλωάμ.
[f] Kurze Erklärung des Evangeliums Johannis.

are many similar prospective references in the Old Testament. It cannot be proved that the appended interpretation characterises a remote individual. The objection is invalid as militating against John's authorship, even in the opinion of Bruno Bauer.

"When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into the which he entered, and his disciples" (John xviii. 1). Here, according to De Wette, the proper translation is: "The brook of cedars," which is an erroneous translation of the noun קִדְרוֹן (2 Sam. xv. 23), and unlikely in *a native of Palestine.*

There are two readings of the text, viz. *τῶν κέδρων*, and *τοῦ κέδρων*. The interpretation of De Wette assumes the correctness of the former, which appears in the received text and the greatest number of authorities, and is also the usual one of the Septuagint. And yet Griesbach, Scholz, and Lachmann have taken *τοῦ κέδρων* into the text. It seems probable that *τοῦ* was very early altered into the plural *τῶν* by transcribers in Asia Minor, who did not understand the singular, but tried in this way to make it intelligible. Hence we may account for its existence in the majority of MSS.

"And one of them named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all." "And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation" (John xi. 49. 51). "And led him away to Annas first; for he was father-in-law to Caiaphas, which was the high priest that same year" (John xviii. 13). "Our evangelist," says Strauss, "designates Caiaphas as the *high priest of that year*, *ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου*, and thus appears to suppose that this dignity, like many Roman magistracies, was an annual one; whereas it was originally held for life; and even in that period of Roman ascendancy was not a regular annual office, but was transferred as often as it pleased the arbitrariness of the Romans[g]. Baur repeats the same objection. It appears to us however that the conclusion is not warranted by the premise. The expression *τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου* does not imply that the writer thought the office of the high priest an annual one. The intention of the evangelist in

[g] English Translation, vol. iii. p. 116.

annexing the phrase was not to give a mere chronological designation, but rather to particularise the year as *remarkable;* "who was high priest *that notable year.*" The year was very memorable in the history of the Jewish nation, and the high priest Caiaphas bore a conspicuous part in the transactions relative to Jesus. If it be remembered that the author of the Gospel wrote in Asia Minor, at a distance from Palestine, and for Gentile readers, the remark appended to Caiaphas' name will appear most apposite, especially as there were many fluctuations and changes about that time in the priesthood, owing to the caprice of the Romans[h].

Thus it appears that the geographical and archaeological difficulties are of no moment. The writer of the Gospel evinces an accurate acquaintance with the localities, customs, and circumstances of Palestine on all other occasions; nor has his general accuracy in regard to such points been called in question. Amid this prevailing correctness, a few passages occur presenting some difficulty; and they are forthwith seized on for the purpose of shewing that the Gospel was not written by a native of Palestine. In this manner the exception is made to overpower the rule, contrary to all sound principles of reasoning. In every ancient historical book difficulties of this kind occur. They are not unusual in Greek and Roman writers. They are to be expected in our remoteness from the scenes and times spoken of. They arise from our imperfect knowledge of the things described. But in the case of profane authors they are not employed to invalidate the authenticity of books. They exercise the patience and ingenuity of critics, who endeavour to explain them as they are able, without converting them into weapons of destructive criticism. Let the writer of the fourth Gospel be dealt with on the same fair and equitable principles as heathen historians. In that case he will stand honourably before an impartial tribunal, a native Jew of Palestine, to whom ignorance of his country's geography and customs cannot be ascribed with justice.

A few traditional reminiscences are inserted, it is alleged, in improper places, such as John iv. 44. "For Jesus himself testified, that a prophet hath no honour in his own country." Here we are informed that it is impossible to discover any consistent

[h] See Baumgarten-Crusius on the expression, zweiter Band, p. 45.

relation between the maxim in question, and the context as to the treatment of a prophet in his own country. "The testimony of Jesus," says Strauss, "as to the treatment of a prophet in his own country, was known to the evangelist traditionally; and he appears to have applied it to Galilee in general, being ignorant of any unfavourable contact of Jesus with the Nazarenes. As therefore he knew of no special scene by which this observation might have been prompted, he introduced it where the simple mention of Galilee suggested it, apparently without any definite idea of its bearing[i]."

Here the whole difficulty is said to turn on the particle γάρ. According to Tholuck it signifies *namely*, introducing by way of explanation the ground or motive *of what follows*. The maxim contained in the forty-fourth verse is inserted by the writer as *preliminary* to the fact related in the succeeding verse, that the Galileans received Jesus this time simply because they had seen the things he did at Jerusalem. "Jesus himself *had* testified that a prophet has no honour in his own country; and when he was come into Galilee, the Galileans received him, merely because they had seen his miracles at Jerusalem." Thus the writer, about to narrate the favourable reception which Christ once met with from his countrymen, accounts for it in perfect conformity with the general maxim enunciated by the great Teacher himself. This use of γάρ is said to be sanctioned by Hartung[k]. Lücke's explanation is similar to that of Tholuck just given. But the reference of γάρ to the forty-fifth verse does not seem natural. That verse presents several difficulties in the way of it. The conduct of the Galilcans is described in it as honourable, whereas by this interpretation they are pointed out as believing *merely* because they saw the miracles performed by Jesus. We are therefore inclined to adopt the exposition of Origen, and to understand πατρίς of *Judea*, though the expression ἰδία πατρίς seems certainly at first sight to allude to Galilee. Judea is called *his own country*, not as being his birth-place, but as *the fatherland of the prophets*. In conformity with this, we find the Jews saying (vii. 52), that no prophet arose out of Galilee. Thus the proverb which Jesus on another occasion applies to Nazareth in

[i] English Translation, vol. ii. p. 178.

[k] Partikellehre, vol. i. p. 467.

Galilee (Matt. xiii. 54, 57; Mark vi. 1, 4, etc.; Luke iv. 24), is here used of Judea; and the aorist ἐμαρτύρησε may be taken in the *consuetudinal* sense, *was accustomed to testify*. Lücke's objection to this exegesis is not formidable, as Baumgarten-Crusius shews.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me" (John xiii. 20). Here it is affirmed, that there is no proper connection between the declaration and the subjects immediately antecedent, or between it and the following context. It is therefore conjectured that a few fragments of the discourse had reached the author of the fourth Gospel by tradition; and that which he sets down in the sixteenth verse suggested, by the law of association, the kindred saying, which he defers till the twentieth verse, although its natural position would have been after the sixteenth.

The purpose for which the declaration in question was introduced, was probably to encourage the disciples, disheartened as they were by allusion to a traitor among them. Jesus points out to them their high value as teachers sent forth by himself to instruct mankind. The objection made to this interpretation, viz. that in such a case he would scarcely have reverted to the traitor immediately after, seems to us of no weight. In the eighteenth and nineteenth verses, Jesus *intimates* that one of them was a traitor, appending to the general intimation the encouraging declaration of the twentieth verse; but at the twenty-first verse, he speaks openly and plainly of what he had merely indicated before. Surely the apostles could carry the encouraging sentence of the sixteenth verse into the detail of the circumstances connected with the traitor. They would naturally bear it on their minds, though Jesus *does* revert to the disheartening fact. Besides, the declaration is most suitably appended to the *general intimation*, inasmuch as it is itself a *general declaration*. De Wette admits, that the explanation furnished by Strauss is not suitable to a writer like John, being adverse to his usual method.

"But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence" (John xiv. 31). The position of these words is

thought to be perplexing, because the summons to depart does not take effect; the discourse is continued ("I am the true vine," etc. John xv. 1 ff.), as if no such command to the disciples had been uttered; and the speaker does not take his departure till a considerable time after.

It is needless to repeat the explanation given by Lücke, Tholuck, Meyer, and others; or the objection made to it by Strauss and De Wette. Some suppose a hiatus between the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters, Jesus and his disciples having really risen from table and departed after the summons, "Arise, let us go hence." The conversation given in the fifteenth chapter may have taken place between the Teacher and the disciples on their way from the city towards the Mount of Olives, near midnight. This conjecture allows of a hiatus or conclusion at the thirty-first verse. But it appears to us more probable, that the fifteenth chapter is a continuation of the preceding discourse uttered in the same place, the command "to arise and depart" not having been carried into effect in consequence of the strong affection between Christ and his disciples, which prompted him to detain them a little longer. He was reluctant to go forth with them because they were to be separated from him; and therefore he *continued* his consolatory address, giving it an *admonitory* character[1].

We have thus endeavoured to vindicate the writer of the fourth Gospel from the charge advanced against him. The three passages last considered present some difficulty; and perhaps many of the explanations proposed to remove it have been unsuccessful. But it does not thence follow that Strauss' explanations, involving as they do a charge of ignorance and incapacity against the writer, are the only correct ones. They are nothing more than conjectures. In opposition to such alleged inaccuracies, we might have referred at length to the general manner of the writer, which is certainly exact and minute regarding persons and places, as may be seen in i. 45; iv. 46; vii. 50; xi. 1, 2; xii. 1, 9; xii. 4; xiv. 22; xviii. 10, 14, 15, 16; xix. 39; xxi. 20. Surely the notices contained in these passages shew an accurate acquaintance on the part of the author with the particulars he introduces, such as

[1] See Paulus' Kommentar, dritter Theil, p. 550.

could hardly be acquired, or at least would not have been presented, except he had lived amid the scenes described. Instead of proving what Weisse wishes to educe from them, they lead to an opposite conclusion. They point to a spectator and eye-witness, not to a remote, pains-taking inquirer. Let us dwell for a moment on the passage to which Blunt has directed the reader's attention. "'Then Simon Peter having a sword drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. The servant's name was Malchus . . . . . And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple: that disciple was known unto the high priest, and went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest . . . But Peter stood at the door without. Then went out that other disciple, which was known unto the high priest, and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter" (John xviii. 10, 15, 16). Here it will be observed, that while the assault committed by Peter is mentioned by all the evangelists, *the name* of the high priest's servant is given by John only. John was *the disciple* known to the high priest. At his request, Peter had been admitted into the high priest's house; for he spake to the damsel that kept the door. Hence the apostle was known to the high priest's servants also, especially as we find him stating, respecting one of the servants who confronted Peter, "*it was his kinsman whose ear Peter cut off.*" If then John was personally acquainted with the high priest's servants, "how natural was it, that in mentioning such an incident as Peter's attack upon one of those servants, he should mention the man by name, and the '*servant's name was Malchus;*' whilst the other evangelists, to whom the sufferer was an individual in whom they took no extraordinary interest, were satisfied with a general designation of him, as 'one of the servants of the high priest[m].'" The entire narrative betrays an eye-witness conversant with all the particulars of the events recorded.

III. Another class of objections is derived from the relation of the fourth Gospel to the first three. There are important diversities between them—(*a*) in *regard to the scene and duration of the Saviour's public ministry.* We need not dwell on this particular,

[m] The Veracity of the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, by the Rev. J. J. Blunt, p. 91.

which is chiefly urged by Weisse against the historical character of John's Gospel. The three synoptists represent Galilee as the theatre of Jesus' ministry, while they appear to limit the duration of it to the space of a year, because Jesus merely goes up to one passover before he suffered. But according to the fourth Gospel, he manifests himself in *Judea* as the allotted sphere of his labours, which locality he left at times only to avoid persecution. And he goes up to *several passovers* at Jerusalem, so that his ministry must have continued for about the space of three years. On comparing these respective representations, Weisse declares both the passover journeys, and the ministry of Christ in Judea with which they are closely connected, to be *unhistorical*, because they are opposed to the liberal views which Jesus entertained of the Mosaic ritual and the external institutes of Judaism. His mind, it is said, was elevated far above the narrow notions of the Jews, and the outward usages characteristic of their ancient economy; for which reason it is improbable that he bound himself to the strict observance of the latter.

That the journeys of Jesus to the capital to keep the usual Jewish festivals were fabricated by the writer of the fourth Gospel, is a hypothesis which could only be probable on the supposition of the evangelist having been a strong Jewish-Christian, which the character of his Gospel wholly contradicts. But he evinces himself throughout to be of anti-jewish, liberal, comprehensive views, and he would not have made a locality like Judea Proper the scene of the Saviour's earthly ministry, for the purpose of describing him as an observer of the ordinary Jewish feasts, had there been no foundation for it in fact. He must have looked upon the journeys to Jerusalem as historic realities, else he would scarcely have attended to them so carefully amid the spiritual and universalist views of religion he entertained. Nor are these journeys to the feasts at all inconsistent with the character of Jesus as depicted by the synoptists. They are in perfect harmony with it. If he intended to establish his claims to Messiahship, it was natural for Him to repair to the centre and seat of the theocracy at high festal seasons, when multitudes, collected from Judea and other lands, might have an opportunity of witnessing the extraordinary appearances of the Founder of a

new kingdom. At these times general attention would be directed to his sublime discourses and marvellous deeds. The people would carry away with them the deep impression they were fitted to leave behind; and thus his title to Messiah would be made known extensively. His object on these occasions was not so much to gain disciples or adherents, as to prove himself to be the Christ, the Son of God. Besides, it was part of the Messiah's work to *fulfil*, not to destroy the law, even according to the other Gospels.

Not only is there no contradiction between the narratives of the synoptists and of John in this respect, but all the circumstances of the case, aided by collateral considerations, unite in shewing that greater historical accuracy belongs to the latter. For, the progress of the evangelical history is gradually unfolded till the last passover—one event naturally follows another in preparing for the mighty catastrophe—the hatred of Jesus' enemies is excited among the congregated masses at Jerusalem from time to time, as he makes his public appearances in the Jewish capital—the storm which was destined to burst on his sacred head, recedes during the intervals of his absence from the centre of the theocracy, only to assume increased fury at his return. Thus the catastrophe comes at last after gradual preparation, so that we can distinctly perceive the successive steps announcing its approach; while in the case of the synoptists, it comes upon the reader in a mode somewhat abrupt and not fully expected. In John, regularity of sequence and attention to *chronological* succession are much more apparent. The order of gradual development is tolerably prominent. All this coincides with the plan of the Gospel as represented by Frommann[n], viz. a depicting of the struggle maintained by Jesus with the powers of darkness, and his victory by apparent defeat; for the evangelist selects his historical materials chiefly from the various journeys to the festivals and from Jesus' sojourn at Jerusalem, inasmuch as the essence of spiritual darkness was concentrated in that particular locality. The synoptists themselves intimate, that the Saviour's ministry was not *confined* to Galilee, and thus indirectly

[n] Ueber die Echtheit und Integrität des Ev. Johan. in the Stud. und Kritik. pp. 882, 883.

corroborate the accuracy of the fourth Gospel. To be consistent therefore, Weisse and his compeers should deny the historical reality of the passages in the first three Gospels relating to this point, such as Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34; Matt. xxvii. 57; Luke x. 38; Matt. iv. 25; Mark iii. 7. Nothing can be more explicit than the words of Matt. xxiii. 37, compared with Luke xiii. 34. The expressions ποσάκις (*how often*), and ἀπ' ἄρτι (*from henceforth*), presuppose *repeated abodes* at Jerusalem and the vicinity. It is vain with Baur to refer *the children*, τέκνα, here spoken of, to all persons who recognised *the centre of the nation* in its capital, and not merely to such as dwelt in it, for the expression ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν is too clear to be otherwise interpreted than of the city itself. In Matt. xxvii. 57, the relation of Joseph of Arimathea to Jesus as *his disciple*, implies the activity of Jesus about Jerusalem previously to the last passover; for there is no doubt that Joseph dwelt at Jerusalem, since he had his sepulchre there. Again, the language of Matt. iv. 25, and Mark iii. 7, obviously intimates that Jesus had been in Judea and Jerusalem before, else the multitudes would not have followed him from these localities. And it may be further asked, how the intimacy existing between Jesus and the two sisters Mary and Martha arose (Luke x. 38-42), if the former had not visited repeatedly the vicinity of the capital?

The fact that the synoptical Gospels speak only of Jesus' last journey to keep the passover at Jerusalem, does not exclude similar journeys, which the evangelists omitted for a reason or reasons we may not be able to explain. Perhaps the oral traditions, which constituted the chief source of the materials employed by those three writers, were propagated mainly from Galilee. If so, it was natural that they should describe the occurrences belonging to that locality, while the preceding passovers were omitted as having no peculiar interest in comparison with the absorbing interest surrounding the last passover-journey. The fact that John, in writing his Gospel, intended to furnish additional matter to the evangelical history then current, may have led him to specify the various journeys with chronological distinctness, in conformity with his general plan.

It appears to us that there is strong internal evidence of the truth and correctness of John's account. Let it be supposed that

the synoptists represent Jesus as simply making one journey to Jerusalem, and that the writer of the fourth Gospel, unable to free himself wholly from the current evangelical tradition embodied in their narrative, converts the one journey into several, as Baur supposes; and let us then consider the view taken by the Tübingen theologian and others, after Bretschneider. They affirm, that the writer was a Gentile-Christian of the second century, belonging to Asia Minor, who composed the book for a doctrinal purpose. The evangelical history had already assumed among Christians a fixed form and type. Consisting as it did of a certain series of historical facts interwoven with doctrines, it was then current. The history of Jesus was well known as embodied in a definite course of events connected with his person. The question then arises, what motive could the writer have had for departing so clearly from the fixed tradition in the present instance? So far from facilitating his object in writing, this very circumstance would have materially retarded it. If he meant to publish a work claiming apostolic origin and authority, would not this departure from the known course of the history have awakened suspicion in the minds of many? Had the church been wholly ignorant of the fact that Jesus repeatedly visited Jerusalem at festival seasons, between His baptism and the last passover, surely the writer must have hazarded the ready and immediate reception of his work in that church, by deviating from the ordinary routine of familiar facts in the life of Christ. If the evangelist was conscious that his departures from the synoptists rested on no historic basis—that they were entirely fictitious—he acted an unwise part in introducing them. On the hypothesis that he was fully assured of their truth, it is easy to explain how he could forsake the fixed tradition embodied in the synoptical Gospels; but his deviations are almost inexplicable on the hypothesis of these sceptical critics. The evangelist, being convinced of their reality, was prompted to present them, knowing that they must commend themselves to the church of the age as historical truths. But there was no perceptible motive adequate to induce a cultivated Gentile-Christian of the second century, who undertook to write a work meant to circulate as an apostolic one, to present a part of the Saviour's history in so different a light from the usual one. By doing so, he would have created

unnecessary difficulties in the way of his own project. The Christians would have stumbled at the very outset, in regard to the recognition of the document. They would have hesitated to receive it as canonical, not only because it appeared for the first time at so late a period, but because the simple story of Jesus was there characterised by important circumstances wholly new.

(*b*) *Diversity in regard to the description of Jesus' person.*

In the first three Gospels, Jesus appears as an extraordinary man endowed with marvellous gifts—as the type of moral greatness—a teacher perfectly adapted to the circumstances of time and place in which he lived. But in the fourth Gospel he appears in unearthly glory—a being descended from heaven, and pre-existing with God before His incarnation.

This objection is of no force. The portraits of Jesus in the synoptists and the fourth Gospel are not opposite. He is viewed in different aspects. All extraordinary persons present a variety of views to the observer; the particular aspect arresting attention usually corresponding with the individuality of the historian, or of the observer. It is absurd to look for a portraiture of the very same internal features in one of large gifts and attainments, from different writers. All that can be expected is a delineation of features *substantially like.* The picture of Jesus presented by John does not *exclude* but *supplement* that of the other evangelists. The latter give the external, national aspect of His life, according to the objective impression which it left on the consciousness of a large circle of observers, who, having been attracted by it, formed *the rudimental* Christian church; while the former presents the ideal spiritual aspect of his entire character and work, in exact accordance with the contemplative cast of mind which the apostle is said to have possessed, and with the more advanced period of the church at which he wrote. He leads us accordingly to deeper thoughts of Christ, as one with the Father in mysterious inseparable union of will and nature; whence we are able to apprehend the high destiny He came to accomplish in carrying out the divine purposes of mercy towards the guilty. *The interior*, so to speak, of Jesus' personality is given by John, from which we are able to obtain a glimpse of *the divine energy* dwelling in Him, which constituted the basis and source of the power attendant on His

unparalleled discourses and deeds. It is true, that the synoptists also exhibit the same divine energy filling His person with the pervading presence of Omnipotence; but they furnish little else than its *external manifestations.*

Thus the complex person of Jesus is delineated neither by the three evangelists nor by John respectively, with a fulness proportionate to the many-sidedness of it. That we may obtain *a comprehensive view* of Messiah, their descriptions must be *combined.* And no reflective reader will deny, that the different lineaments are capable of being thus blended together harmoniously.

In illustration of the difference between the representations of Jesus given by the four evangelists, attention has been directed to an analogous case; viz., the character and spirit of Socrates, as drawn by Plato and by Xenophon. The latter has confined himself chiefly to the mind of the philosopher directed to *practical* objects. But this does not exhaust the comprehensive scope of Socrates' genius. He was endowed with varied *speculative* ability, as we see from Plato. And yet none has ventured to discover opposition between these diversified aspects, or to set aside the authenticity of either work in which the Athenian philosopher is described. Why then should any, pretending to philosophic criticism, rashly impugn the fourth Gospel?

We need not shew the mode in which the different aspects of Jesus' person are adapted to the mental peculiarities of the persons to whom the gospels are attributed, and to the time at which the first three were written as compared with the fourth, implying a considerable development of Christian reflection when John lived at Ephesus. The first three Gospels suit original converts to Christianity; the last is adapted to a period of advancement. The national aspect of Jesus' life is presented in the former; the latter was written after the Jewish polity had been abolished, and when cultivated Gentile mind had been influenced by the new system of religion.

(*c*) It has been inferred, that *the discourses of Jesus in John's Gospel are mainly free compositions of the evangelist, because they present a remarkable contrast to the discourses put into the mouth of Jesus by the synoptists, both in matter and form, as well as a striking similarity to the writer's own style of thinking and writing. We seem*

not to hear Jesus speak, so much as the evangelist himself. The subjective views and feelings of the latter exercised considerable influence upon those discourses. This conclusion is aided by the alleged fact that they do not correspond to the laws of verisimilitude or memory.

Here we cannot refrain from remarking, that the defenders of the Gospel's authenticity have made undue concessions to their opponents. They have exposed themselves to the charge of inconsistency. They have left undefined the separating line between the subjective and the objective; so that Baur[o], who reasons most conclusively against Lücke and Neander on this point, may well ask, if there be so much of the subjective in these discourses, who shall say that every thing is not subjective? The consequence naturally follows from the premises admitted by critics like those just named; and the Tübingen theologian has not failed to put them into a dilemma, out of which it is difficult to escape. *They* are reluctant to see or to admit the conclusion fairly deducible from their own statements; while *he* fearlessly urges and defends it.

In answering this particular objection, we refer to the general remarks already made, which will help to take off its edge. In addition to them, the following observations should be attended to:—

1. In various instances the evangelist has carefully separated the expressions uttered by Christ, and the sense he attaches to them. Hence there could not have been the mingling of *the objective* and *subjective*, at least in these passages. The fact in question is a presumption in favour of the writer's *general* fidelity. See ii. 19, 21; vii. 38, 39; xii. 32, 33; xviii. 9, etc.

2. The prophetic declarations of Jesus, especially those relating to His impending sufferings, death, and resurrection considered separately as well as in connection with the similar declarations of the other evangelists, favour the hypothesis of John's accuracy. The disciples did not understand the statements of Jesus relative to His sufferings and death, so that they were quite unprepared for the catastrophe. Not till after his ascension, when their minds were supernaturally enlightened, did they distinctly recollect how he had told them of all that had happened. We might therefore

[o] Die kanonischen Evangelien, p. 292, et seqq.

expect to find the intimations He had given them in the days of His flesh couched in figurative language, or in a form partly enigmatical—a form which they were so dull as not to understand till the predictions had been fulfilled. Accordingly, in the fourth Gospel, these predictions present the figurative character in question, so that we can at once understand the reason of their true meaning being hid from the persons to whom they were first spoken. See vii. 33, 34; viii. 21; x. 11, 17, 18; xii. 23, etc.; xiv. 1-4, 18, etc., 28; xvi. 16; vii. 6, etc.; xii. 8; iii. 14. That these passages should have been presented by a writer in *their present* form, *after the things predicted had taken place*, is scarcely probable. Their character is just such as might have been expected in the circumstances in which they were uttered. They still bear a future aspect. Obscure in form, the disciples did not understand them. But in the first three Gospels, the cognate passages are of a somewhat different form. They would lead us to suppose that the Saviour spoke to the apostles of approaching events connected with Himself in *definite* expressions of an unfigurative character. And as these very evangelists state that the disciples did not understand the expressions in question, there is some difficulty in accounting for the uncommon dulness exhibited. If Jesus spoke in unfigurative and plain words, how could there be so great stupidity? Here therefore, John's description is nearer the original than that of the synoptists. And if his Gospel present evident marks of fidelity in regard to these prophetic declarations, it may be inferred that similar fidelity pervades the longer discourses and conversations contained in it.

3. Though the mysterious union of the Logos is frequently alluded to in the Gospel, yet it is specially worthy of remark, that the writer never puts the title λόγος or θεός into the mouth of Jesus himself, in all the utterances made respecting His own nature. The term λόγος is applied to Christ solely at the commencement of the Gospel, where the author himself speaks, and where he sets forth his own views of the Son's exalted dignity[p]. Had he been an undiscriminating writer, or had he belonged to

[p] This idea, which Strauss himself admits to be weighty, was first stated, as far we know, by Paulus, in his review of the second edition of Lücke's Commentar in the Lit. Blatt. of the allgem. Kirchenzeitung, 1834, No. 18.

the second century and lived amid the circumstances assumed by Lützelberger, Baur, and others, it is not likely that he would have refrained so cautiously from inserting this title in some of the discourses attributed to Jesus or to John the Baptist or to others who conversed with Jesus. The very fact that the evangelist has only used the title himself, favours the view that he has faithfully given both the ideas and expressions of Jesus and of other speakers, without attributing to them his own sentiments or phraseology.

This argument cannot be turned aside by the reply of Baur, that though the prologue alone contain *the word* Logos, yet the whole Gospel is nothing else than an unfolding of the particulars contained in the Logos-idea; for *in the sense he intends*, the statement is incorrect. The fourth Gospel is not a *speculative*, *dialectic* explication of the idea, as any one may see who reads it impartially. It exhibits the plain and practical, along with the higher aspects of the divine life. *Discourses* are narrated in it which have no perceptible, *direct* bearing on the Logos, in making the fundamental idea of the term more intelligible. *Events* are described of which the same thing may be predicated. But in the mode of viewing the Gospel adopted by Baur, every thing has a *manifest connection* with the Logos-idea, an opinion *so far* erroneous as it attributes to the entire composition a *definite*, *detailed*, *logical* plan, exhibiting speculative idealism associated with a comprehensive synthesis. Were the notion of this critic fairly carried out, it might be applied to any of the first three Gospels, of which it could be shewn by an *analogous process*, that *they* develop the contents of the Logos-idea. Apply Baur's argument fairly, and it proves too much.

Before leaving the topic, it will be expedient to examine Strauss' assertion respecting the Baptist, viz., that the evangelist has given his own style to the prophet of the wilderness; and that he is even responsible, to a large extent, for *the matter* as well as *the manner* of what the Baptist utters. There are two passages on which this charge is founded; viz., i. 16, ff., iii. 31-36. With these may be considered another of the same kind, where it is said that the writer is responsible for *the matter* of a discourse attributed to Jesus, iii. 16-21.

"John bare witness of Him, and cried, saying, This was He of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for He was before me. And of His fulness have all we received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him. And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No. Then said they unto him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias" (i. 15-23). In relation to this passage it is manifest, that the words of the sixteenth verse, and especially ἡμεῖς πάντες, were not spoken by the Baptist, since they are at variance with the knowledge he had of Jesus' person and dignity. They must therefore be attributed to the evangelist himself. The writer's reflections concerning the person of Christ continue to the eighteenth verse inclusive; and the words of the sixteenth belong immediately to those of the fourteenth. In the fifteenth, the Baptist's testimony is introduced as confirmatory of the truth of a statement just made respecting Jesus. The correctness of this exegesis will be apparent to him who compares the τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ and the πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας of the fourteenth verse, with the ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες, κ. τ. λ., of the sixteenth. Thus the writer, having introduced the language of John the Baptist in corroboration of his own sentiments—language important in his view, inasmuch as he had been a disciple of that very John—returns to his own reflections, without marking the transition.

"He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: He that cometh from heaven is above all. And what He hath seen and heard, that He testifieth; and no man receiveth His testimony. He that hath received His testimony hath set to his seal that God is true. For

He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him" (iii. 31-36). It is wholly improbable that these are the words of John the Baptist. Nor can it be satisfactorily shewn that the writer intended them to be understood as his words. Hence they must be explained on the same principle as the preceding passage. The evangelist continues the idea expressed by John, explaining and amplifying it from the maturity of his own knowledge and experience. The transition indeed is not marked. It is silently made. But there is sufficient internal evidence to shew, that the evangelist's own reflections commence at the thirty-first verse, and are continued till the thirty-sixth. Should it be insisted by any, that the reflections of the writer are mingled with the Baptist's discourse in a manner which excludes a distinct separation of the respective elements, as John enlarges the ideas originally expressed by the Baptist, no valid objection could be urged against the view, though the former explanation seems to us the preferable one.

"For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be be saved. He that believeth on Him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God" (iii. 16-21). Here the difficulty lies in determining, whether the words in question form a continuation of the Saviour's discourse with Nicodemus, or the reflections of the evangelist himself, in the form of an expansion of the idea just uttered by Jesus. Several circumstances may be urged

in favour of both. But we are inclined to think that there is also, in the present case, an insensible transition from the conversation of Jesus to the writer's own thoughts and language. In Paul's epistle to the Galatians there is a like transition, which Tholuck has appropriately compared with the present; while the first epistle of John shews this peculiarity to belong to the writer. Without marking the transition, the evangelist passes at once, and imperceptibly, from the direct utterances of the Saviour to the statement of his own ideas. He added new thoughts suggested by those of the Saviour, and in continuation of them—thoughts naturally introduced, forming an appropriate conclusion to the discourse. It is true that the conference breaks off abruptly at the fifteenth verse, according to this interpretation; but it is apparent that the whole has not been recorded. *Leading ideas* are given, and that too, probably in the original form they were delivered in; but explanations were perhaps subjoined, which have not been preserved by the writer.

This view of the passage is recommended by the fact that the dialogue ceases, and that the terms *μονογενής*, *ἠγάπησεν* (verse 16), and *ἠγάπησαν* (verse 20), belong to John's terminology. But there is no substantial difference between the two explanations of the passage, except on the implied assumption that an apostle was not the writer. Whence did John derive the ideas contained in verses 16-21? They could not have been the product of his own unaided reflection. They were derived from intercourse with the Redeemer. The Spirit promised to the disciples assisted in their conception.

If the conversation with Nicodemus contain sufficient internal evidence to shew that it took place in the manner related, the question need not be proposed how the evangelist came to the knowledge of it. It was held by night, and no witnesses were present of a disposition which Nicodemus had to fear; but there is not a word in the entire narrative proving that none were there except Jesus and the Jewish rabbi. As far as the record is concerned, other parties may have been at the interview. It excludes such individuals alone as Nicodemus feared or suspected.

There will be no *substantial* difference between the two views of this passage, to which allusion has been made, in the eye of the

true expositor, who regards the writer as filled with the Spirit of Christ; for in this aspect of the case, the sentiments of John were not so much his own independent conclusions, as the reflection of the Redeemer's image within him.

Another point of difference between the discourses in John and the synoptists, is the want of parables in the former as compared with the latter. We are informed by some critics, that there is nothing of the *gnomic* and *parabolic* in our Gospel, such as was usual in the East; but, on the contrary, there are long discourses of an artificial, dialectic character, which could scarcely be retained in the memory, or faithfully reproduced by a hearer. Nor is there any *point* in them which might serve to fasten them in the recollection. Rather are they pervaded by an uniform sameness. The object which the evangelist had in view, the supposition that the evangelical tradition embodied in other Gospels was known to his readers, and the more advanced period of Christianity at which his Gospel appeared, will account for this diversity. Writing for more cultivated Gentile-Christians, John selected discourses in which the form suited to the dull apprehension of the first Christians was not prominent. Yet there are some discourses and expressions possessing a gnomological, or parabolic character, such as x. 1 ff.; xv. 1 ff.; iii. 8; iv. 34-38; ix. 39; xvi. 21. A gnome is found in iii. 27, and a parabolic sentence in iii. 29. which are suitable to the character and style of the Baptist.

We deem it unnecessary to specify other individual points urged against the authenticity of the discourses and dialogues introduced into John's Gospel. That they are different, both in matter and form, from those of the synoptists is apparent; but it remains to be proved that the difference is of a character to evince their freeness or fictitiousness as compositions of the evangelist. It has not yet been proved that they are contrary to the laws of verisimilitude, or of a memory, like John's, aided by divine influence. Here the negative criticism directed against our Gospel has failed to educe satisfactory results. "It is certain," says Baumgarten-Crusius, "that Christ spake even so as the fourth Gospel represents Him. . . . . Of that which the narrator could call *his own* with entire propriety, he has incorporated nothing."[q]

[q] Theol. Ausleg. d. Johann. Schriften, Einleit. p. 35.

We shall now condense some of the considerations already adduced in a scattered form, converting them into positive circumstances in favour of the Gospel's authenticity, and adding others not yet mentioned.

1. The writer expressly styles himself *an immediate disciple of the Lord* (i. 14), and *an eye-witness* (xix. 34). This eye-witness of the closing scenes of Jesus' life is identical with the beloved disciple (xix. 25-27), to whom the Master, before expiring on the cross, affectionately consigned his earthly parent (xxi. 24). There can be little doubt, that *the beloved disciple* was none other than *the apostle John;* for the three who shared the Saviour's intimacy were Peter, James, and John. He cannot have been the first, because Peter is generally designated by name, and expressly distinguished from the disciple whom Jesus loved (xiii. 24; xx. 2). We are therefore shut up to a choice between the two sons of Zebedee. He cannot have been James, because John lived to old age, as is implied in the twenty-first chapter of our Gospel, and embodied in early tradition; while his brother was killed by Herod Agrippa about ten years after the ascension. The connection between the beloved disciple and Peter, as it appears in the Gospel, viewed along with the intimacy between Peter and John appearing in the Acts of the Apostles, sufficiently proves that John was *the beloved disciple.*

The mode in which the evangelist designates himself, avoiding all mention of his name, may be attributed to humility and modesty. He refrains from the very appearance of magnifying himself as the disciple whom his Master loved.

Some have supposed that the unknown writer who composed the Gospel adopted this manner of expression because he wrote in John's name, and wished the work to be regarded as the apostle's. But it is quite improbable that a forger should follow this way of indicating the apostle he wished to personate. He would rather have employed a direct and definite method of marking him whom he wished to be considered the author. He would have given the appellation *John* once at least, instead of employing a circuitous process which the readers could not have understood without difficulty; for in the latter case they must have instituted a process of reasoning and inference aided by other books of the New

Testament, for the purpose of perceiving the real person indicated. We can readily explain how John himself could so speak without naming himself; but it is not easy to see the probability of a later writer following the same course, because it must have contributed to weaken the impression he meant to leave on the minds of readers. The apostle might well be satisfied with the indirect, concealed mode of allusion to himself, because the persons among whom he had lived so long, and for whom he chiefly wrote, were already acquainted with the authorship. They needed no express or definite specification of the writer; and the apostle could therefore consult his own feelings, and draw a veil of modesty over himself.

The truth of these remarks is abundantly confirmed by the fact, that the earliest tradition of the Christian church identifies the beloved disciple with the apostle John. Not a trace of departure from the uniformity of the tradition is to be met with. It must therefore be contemporary with the Gospel's publication, having been derived from the author himself, from those into whose hands he first gave the Gospel, or from the early readers of it, who may have known the fact independently of the apostle.

We deem it superfluous to allude to the attempts of Lützelberger, Weisse, and Baur to set aside this argument, because they are too futile to merit attention.

2. The manner in which John the Baptist is mentioned attests the authenticity. Although he is named about twenty times, the epithet ὁ βαπτιστὴς, affixed by the synoptists to distinguish him from John the apostle, is never put. And yet the evangelist carefully distinguishes the two Judases (xiv. 22). So also he writes *Peter*, or *Simon Peter*, but not *Simon* alone, except where the name is first introduced. If then the author were different from the apostle John, why did he not carefully distinguish him from the other John, by appending ὁ βαπτιστὴς to the latter? Is it not natural to suppose, that being himself the other John of the evangelical history, he did not consider it necessary to make the separation apparent. Surely an impostor would have guarded against this mode of expression, and imitated the synoptists in drawing a line between the two Johns.

3. The manner in which the writer marks the ideas entertained by the disciples of Jesus' words and deeds, implies an interest in the subject which could only be felt by a surviving eye-witness. The natural method which any other than an eye-witness would have followed, could scarcely have been that of the Gospel. A person guilty of imposture would have combined his own interpretation with the utterances of Jesus. His own subjective views would have been put forward as the views of the divine Actor, which the disciples generally misunderstood. It was meet for *an apostle* to separate the mistakes into which himself and his associates had formerly fallen, from the real meaning and object of Jesus as correctly apprehended at a subsequent period; but an *external individual* occupying a position altogether distant from the scenes he describes, would not have distinguished the earlier from the later conceptions. The latter alone would have been stated directly.

4. Internal evidence proves that the author was a Jew. Hence he refers to the fulfilment of Old Testament declarations in the life of Jesus, and in his manner of quotation evinces an acquaintance with the original text of the Old Testament, which shews he belonged to Palestine. The evangelist gives his own version of these passages oftener than the Septuagint translation, so that he could not have been a Gentile Christian belonging to the second century, but a native Palestinian Jew. Even an educated Alexandrian Jew could scarcely have done this, being accustomed to the Hellenistic language, and the use of the Old Testament in it alone. In confirmation of this statement, we refer to such passages as xii. 40; xiii. 8; xix. 37, where, although the evangelist may possibly have had the Septuagint before him, he has special regard to the original, and makes his own translation accordingly. He must therefore have been a Palestinian by birth, and received the usual education of the country.

5. Several peculiarities in the Gospel point to an eye-witness. Thus a freshness of recollection is prominent in the description of various scenes which must have been indelibly imprinted on the mind of an eye-witness, i. 37-40; xiii. 1-11; xviii. 10-16, 25-27; xx. 3-10. There is also a minute specification of the time and place at which occurrences took place, which forms a striking

contrast to the vague notices of the synoptists. It is true that the Gospel, in accordance with the great doctrinal purpose for which it was chiefly written, contains fewer *historical* notices than the synoptists; yet the very fact of these minute particulars being occasionally introduced, points to an eye-witness whose mind, though occupied with doctrine, would almost unconsciously glance at subordinate and secondary points. Such things would slip from him imperceptibly, while he was carried back to scenes and discourses at which he was present. All this is unlike literary imposture, especially a work conceived and executed in the spirit of a doctrinal mysticism or speculative theosophy.

6. The concluding clause of the thirty-first of the fourteenth chapter, "Arise, let us go hence," shews that the writer was an eye-witness, and that he has faithfully reproduced the discourses of Jesus with which it is connected. It should be observed, that the command of Jesus to his disciples to rise up from the table and depart thence, did not imply reluctance on His part to submit to the will of His heavenly Father. Having discoursed to the friends He had selected on earth, He was now ready to meet his sufferings. And yet the conversation is continued immediately after. The words in question interrupt the current of it. They come in quite unexpectedly. It is difficult to account for their introduction on the assumption of the Gospel's first appearance in the second century, especially as there is nothing in the succeeding narrative to indicate immediate compliance with the command. On the hypothesis of the writer's presence, all is natural and easy of explanation; while it is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to account for the introduction of the words in question into the midst of a most affecting conversation on any other supposition, inasmuch as they break the thread of it. The parting words of Jesus must have left a lasting impression on the minds of his apostles. The circumstances and season in which they were uttered conspired to invest them with surpassing solemnity. It was midnight when these disciples, in the solitary chamber, received the promise of the Saviour's peace, and heard from his lips those affecting words that still speak so powerfully to the highest emotions of the human heart. Whether the disciples rose up immediately from the table and departed, or

whether they were detained a little longer by the Saviour's love as if he were reluctant to leave them, it is apparent that the command to arise was vividly remembered in connection with the discourses. It had no *natural association* with the latter, though it had an *historical connection* with them. Now if the discourses were the free compositions of a later writer, to what cause is the insertion of this clause owing? It disturbs the uniformity. Its presence creates a difficulty. Hence the position it occupies is a strong presumption in favour of *the historical truth* of the discourses in whose midst it is found. One present in the chamber, remembering *the discourses*, would have recollected *it;* but a later writer freely composing the long conversation in question, would have placed the clause at the end. Or could we suppose him to have inserted it in its present place, he would have made some statement to obviate its apparent anomaly in regard to what follows, either that the Master and his disciples did rise forthwith from the table and had the following conversation on the way to the garden; or that His love, unwilling to leave them, prevented an immediate departure from the room, till the divine Speaker had poured into their hearts other words of instructive and consolatory import in the same chamber. Thus, so far from the clause disproving the Gospel's authenticity, as Strauss and Baur assume, it has an opposite bearing.

In bringing our remarks on the authenticity of the fourth Gospel to a close, we cannot refrain from expressing our deep and growing conviction of the historical fidelity by which the sacred document is pervaded. That it bears the impress of the beloved disciple, fresh and vivid from his tender spirit, appears to us unquestionable. And that it *purports to be* from his pen is not less apparent. There are, it is true, difficulties connected with it which may never be satisfactorily resolved, amid our ignorance of the circumstances in which it appeared; but such difficulties belong in part to every ancient book, and are immeasurably increased in the present case, on the supposition of our Gospel having originated in the second century on Hellenistic ground. The man who could exhibit such a portrait of Christ from his own reflection and fancy at that later period, must have been a prodigy to which the century presents nothing approaching

to a parallel; for it need not be told how barren that century was in individuals of creative intellect and large heart, like the author of the document in question. And then it must be maintained, not only that he produced a work equally removed from the anthropomorphic, material religiousness, as from the narrow intellectuality of his day, but that he remained in miraculous concealment. The spirit, elevated so far above his countrymen and contemporaries, giving utterance to such aspects of Christ's character as have attracted universal humanity in all future time, continued unknown. Exerting, as he did, immeasurable influence on the consciousness of the Christian church, he was always buried in impenetrable obscurity. And yet he was able to procure universal acceptance for his work as though it really belonged to an apostolic time, and to an eye-witness of the sufferings of Christ. He completely succeeded in his imposture. The few great ideas which he clothed with flesh and blood, commended themselves with astonishing readiness to the mind and heart of the Christian world, undetected in their source, age, and aim. Those who can believe all this, with Baur and his school, have renounced all claim to genuine historical criticism, by abandoning themselves to a reckless caprice, where calmness of investigation and unbiassed love of truth are entirely wanting. "This production," says the vigorous-minded Baumgarten-Crusius, "could not have been a concerted, systematic *forgery*, for such it must have been if it did not stand in actual connection with the person of John. It is undeniable that the author meant to be regarded as John. But who can concede, that in the oldest *church* so enormous a falsehood under an apostolic name was possible—the fabrication of *a Gospel* not mixed with fables, or with single, distorted, or invented utterances of Jesus, but on the contrary, of such a Gospel as appeared to break loose entirely from the universal evangelic basis? Besides, who would expect from the church that it could allow itself to be deceived to such a degree, as to convert something in this way into a *leading, fundamental book*, in which notwithstanding some recollections of the real John must have remained? On the supposition of so great a deception, it was no more than consistent to deny the existence of an Ephesian John. Moreover, since the middle of the second

century, and that too first of all in those very districts, ecclesiastical deliberations had been usual, and parties, churches, countries, had begun to keep a mutual watch on one another. And yet there are only the *Alogi* among the parties who spoke against the writings of John as if they were a forgery; very unfortunate indeed in their positive result, that Cerinthus composed them; a party, besides, who belonged to *the school* rather than the church. We may even conjecture that perhaps they were not at all a proper ecclesiastical party; as Christian and heathen elements were often found together in sects down to the fourth century. History too knows not of the least acceptance which the Alogi had. But it is surely a strong historic testimony in favour of John's Gospel, that it *continued*, yea that it kept its ground with a reputation always increasing; while the very rich literature of the second century perished with few exceptions[r]."

IV. The immediate Occasion and Object of the Gospel.

In a fragment of Clemens Alexandrinus preserved by Eusebius[s], we meet with a tradition that John, last of all, perceiving that *carnal things* were sufficiently made known in the Gospels, being encouraged by his familiar friends, and urged by the Spirit, wrote a *spiritual Gospel.* A similar account is given by the anonymous author of a Fragment on the Canon, in Muratori, where these intimate friends of the apostle who persuaded him to write, are specified as the immediate disciples of Jesus, and bishops[t]. The tradition is repeated, enlarged, and altered by subsequent writers, such as Jerome[u]; but if it be founded in truth, the oldest form of it is the most probable. We do not think that the tradition of the oldest elders related by Clement is accurate in the very shape it appears in under Eusebius' hands, where the *carnal* Gospels are evidently restricted to the three canonical books. In the time of John, many Gospels, chiefly oral, were current; and therefore the tradition given by Clement could only mean that John found none of the existing Gospels suited to his purposes and to the wants of his age; for which reason

[r] Theolog. Ausleg. der Johanneischen Schriften, Einleit. pp. 20-23.
[s] H. E. vi. 14.
[t] Muratori Antiq. Ital. Med. Aevi. iii. p. 854. See the passage in Credner's Einleit, § 97.
[u] Prooem in Matt.

he wrote his own. It is quite consistent with this fact to believe, that the apostle had not the three written Gospels before him, though he was familiar with the evangelical traditions from which they were principally extracted. Nor is there any thing in the fourth Gospel itself incongruous with the account as thus explained, and as divested of its later form. The substance and tenor of the sacred book agree with the tradition *substantially*. John's familiar acquaintances, among whom were disciples of Jesus, may very naturally have requested him to write a Gospel. The promptings of his mind excited by the Spirit accorded. Thus both external and internal impulses united in inducing him to undertake the work. The attempts that have been made to discredit the tradition in question appear to us gratuitous. There is certainly nothing improbable in the substance of it; for even in the second century, several of the Redeemer's disciples were at Ephesus, as we learn from Eusebius. Whether those who requested him to write the Gospel were the persons whom he particularly addresses in the words of xix. 35, xx. 31, is a point worth considering; as also, whether they be specially introduced in i. 14 ff. and xxi. 24. It is not at all unlikely that the reference is to them in *οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθής*, *κ. τ. λ*, words not written by John himself, but containing the attestation of fellow-disciples, even of such as may have had part in requesting him to write a Gospel.

The *object* which the apostle had in view is thus stated by himself: "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that, believing, ye might have life through His name." He meant to prove that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and at the same time to convince his readers, that faith in the person and doctrine of Jesus is the source of true happiness. Thus his design was a general one, similar to that of the other evangelists, who doubtless wrote with the view of extending and establishing the faith as it is in Jesus.

In conformity with this general object have the materials been selected and arranged. Thus the apostle adduces—

The testimony of John the Baptist, who, emphatically disclaiming his own Messiahship, referred the Jews to Jesus as the long-expected Redeemer of the world.

His own testimony is also given.

The works which he did, especially the miracles, also attested his divine mission and power.

The accomplishment of Old Testament prophecies in the person and ministry of Jesus is next recorded.

Discourses are narrated, whose purport is to shew the dignity and divinity of His person as the only Mediator.

His doctrine and work are presented in an aspect of spiritual comprehensiveness towards Jews and Gentiles, which has a similar tendency to exhibit Him as the Son of God, the incarnate Logos—one with the Father;—or, in other words, the Messiah long announced.

But it has been thought, that in addition to the prominent purpose of the writer as stated by himself, he had another subordinate object. The general scope does not exclude a particular one. He may even have had several secondary designs. That he had a particular, in addition to the leading object, has been commonly inferred from the nature and contents of the Gospel itself. But in determining what it was, there has not been unanimity of opinion. Let us therefore inquire into the special scope.

i. It has been frequently believed that the special object was *polemic*—the apostle intending to oppose and refute certain erroneous sentiments.

(*a*) Some think that he designed to refute the Ebionites or Judaising Christians, who united the carnal peculiarities of the Jewish with those of the Christian religion, applying the common Jewish representation of the Messiah to Jesus, and considering Him to be no more than a man. This was the opinion of Epiphanius, Jerome, Oeder, and L. Lange, though they assume, at the same time, that the Ebionites were not *the only* heretics against whom the apostle wrote.

(*b*) Others think that he wrote against the Gnostics, especially Cerinthus, the Docetae, the Nicolaitans. This opinion is found in Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Jerome, Oeder, Oporinus, Kuhn, Mosheim, and Dr. H. Owen.

(*c*) A third hypothesis is, that the Gospel was intended to

counteract the views held by the Zabians, or followers of John the Baptist. So Grotius, Schlichting, Wolzogen, Herder, Overbeck; while Michaelis, Storr, Schmidt, Hug, and Kleuker, include *the Gnostics* as well as the Zabians.

Let us proceed to examine these several hypotheses in detail:—

(*a*) We do not deny that the Gospel before us is opposed to the views of those strongly-Judaising Christians. It contains spiritual doctrines unlike the one-sided views peculiar to the heretical party in question. The comprehensive, universal system advocated by the writer, harmonises with the creed of Paul, rather than that of the persons who opposed the apostle of the Gentiles with so much bitterness. The passages adduced in favour of the hypothesis, such as i. 13, 17; iii. 3; iv. 21; v. 9 ff.; vi. 32; x. 16, are indeed of an opposite character and spirit to Ebionitism; but there is nothing in them, or in any other part of the Gospel, that shews an apparent design to refute the heresy in question, or presents a marked antithesis to its essential elements. The polemic reference to such narrow legalism is too remote to justify the assumption of an express refutation. It is not impressed on the contents nor shadowed forth in the plan of the work. All that can be affirmed with safety is, that the doctrine it contains is of a contrary tendency to the Ebionitish creed. Pure Christianity is necessarily adverse to Jewish errors. But it is likewise adverse to *all error;* and there is no more evidence in the document itself that it was specially meant to refute the Ebionite heresy, than many others Hence the hypothesis must be rejected as untenable.

(*b*) That John intended to oppose Cerinthus specially, or the gnosis developed by him out of Judaism, cannot be rendered probable, except the sentiment be so modified as to lose its definiteness. Amid the contradictory accounts of Cerinthus' doctrine left us by the fathers, it is very difficult to ascertain his exact belief. Irenaeus has not represented his opinions correctly, in several important particulars; or he has given, at least, a partial view of them. Neither can Epiphanius be relied on as a true witness. Cerinthus seems to have taught, that the supreme Logos or Spirit of God first united itself with the man Jesus at His baptism; but that the Logos was separated from Him at the com-

mencement of his sufferings, and reascended to the Father. Hence the union of the human and the divine was not permanent or abiding in His person. In opposition to this leading tenet of Cerinthus, it is conjectured that the apostle presents the essential, constant, inseparable union of the two natures in Messiah's person. The Logos *became incarnate;* and the connection then formed was of no temporary kind. The prologue of the Gospel is therefore thought to be specially directed against the tenets of this heresiarch. But we need to be better acquainted with the sentiments of this person before the opinion that John's motive was to oppose him, can be made at all probable; since there is no obvious antagonism in the didactic statements of the Gospel to the chief dogma in his creed. Although some verses in the prologue may be considered as pointing directly at Cerinthism, they lack definiteness when so viewed, not to mention that they are *inadequate* counter-statements. In the light of propositions *specially levelled* against it, they are somewhat vague and indistinct. Indeed we cannot doubt that if the Gospel had been chiefly designed to counteract the peculiar tenets of this heretic, its form would have been different in many places. How could the apostle have allowed such a passage as i. 32, etc. to stand as it is, since it appears to favour the notion of Cerinthus? And in the history of Christ's passion and death, surely there must have been some intelligible allusions to the nature of the sufferer remaining as it was. In short, the Gospel is not pervaded by antagonism to Cerinthus. A few passages may have been intended to refute such sentiments as he held; but the production, as a whole, bears no hostile aspect to them. It does not adduce certain truths *in a manner indicative of design*, on the part of the author, to confute them in particular.

Others imagine, that the Gospel was chiefly directed against the Docetae, or those who held that the entire human appearance of Christ was a mere vision, and thus denied the reality of His humanity by insisting on *the appearance* of a body belonging to Him.

This view is more plausible than any of the preceding. There are parts of the Gospel which seem to be directly opposed to Docetism, such as the following, to which attention is drawn by several writers: i. 14; xix. 34; xx. 20, 27. And yet they may

be readily explained *irrespectively of an antithesis* to the heresy in question. Even granting that they were designedly opposed to it, that fact will not prove that the entire Gospel was wholly, or chiefly meant to refute the particular heresy. Its plan and contents are not arranged so as to presuppose *opposition*. Whatever may be said of some passages, which may have been pertinently employed against Docetism, *the specific object* does not appear throughout the work. The *epistles* of John favour the anti-docetic view, as far as *they* are concerned; particularly the first, which is generally acknowledged to have been written in the same circumstances with the Gospel. But the same purpose need not be attributed to both. Rather does it seem an unnecessary task in an author to compose two works with the same design.

The most ingenious advocacy of this view is exhibited by Scheckenburger[x], who labours to shew that the important facts in the life of Jesus omitted by the writer, are best explained by the designed anti-tendency of the entire Gospel. His proof, however, does not appear strong enough to sustain the hypothesis; and it were superfluous to allude to it any farther than to pronounce Lücke's[y] refutation successful.

Irenaeus includes the Nicolaitans among those whom John undertook to refute in the Gospel. We are unable to discover any foundation for this, except the single place in the Apocalypse, where the Nicolaitans are introduced. That they should not be classed with the Gnostics, as this ancient father placed them, is universally admitted. Nor is it at all clear that they formed a particular sect. It is more probable that the name is figurative, describing certain false teachers in the time of John, who maintained obnoxious doctrines. Their origin and tenets are involved in great obscurity; and it is most unlikely that the apostle wrote his Gospel in opposition to them.

(*c*) The polemic allusion to those who held John the Baptist in such high veneration as to reckon him the Messiah, has found many advocates. References to them are discovered in John i. 7, 8, 9, where it is emphatically and repeatedly stated, that the Baptist was not the Enlightener of the world. The evangelist, it

[x] Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 60, et seqq. No. vi.
[y] Einleit. § 13, p. 219, et seqq.

is said, has also selected discourses of Jesus containing declarations of His superiority to John, and admissions of the latter's inferiority by himself (i. 15, 20-31; iii. 26-36; v. 34-37; x. 41). We know little of this sect. Traces of it indeed have been sought in various parts of the New Testament, such as Luke iii. 15; Acts xiii. 25; xviii. 25; xix. 1, etc.; but the persons there designated were not enemies to Christianity, but merely ignorant of it—knowing none other baptism than John's. As far as appears, they were desirous to learn the peculiar doctrines of Christianity; and when they did learn them, they may have *adopted*, rather than *combated* them. Nor is there any historic proof that they assumed an antagonistic attitude to the Christian religion in Asia Minor when John wrote his gospel. He may have been anxious to win them over to the truth, because their belief exhibited favourable points of union with it. In short, the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions, whose composition belongs to the third century, where they are mentioned as a Jewish sect along with the Sadducees and Samaritans, are too uncertain evidence for the fact that they existed as *a sect* in the time of the apostles, and regarded the Baptist as the Messiah. Whether the Zabians, or disciples of John, of whom Norberg[z] first published a clear account, be connected with, or descended from, the ancient sect can scarcely be ascertained at the present day. Every circumstance is more favourable to the view of such as deny any historical connection between them and the early disciples of the Baptist. Now, where so little is known, there can be no satisfactory proof that the apostle wrote against the Zabians, especially since the very existence of them in the capacity of a sect hostile to Christianity in Asia Minor, during the life of the last surviving apostle, cannot be established. All the passages supposed to apply directly to them, admit of a better explanation on other grounds.

We have thus glanced at all the hypotheses maintaining that John's object in writing was *polemical*, and have seen that they are improbable. No clear, indubitable evidence in favour of any one of them, or of several together, has yet been furnished by their advocates. While some truth may lie at their basis, they are

[z] In the Commentatt. Reg. Societ. Gött., anno 1780, vol. iii. De religione et lingua Sabaeorum.

certainly untenable in the mode in which they have been presented. They are too specific and definite. They reduce the scope of the sacred document to a point too insignificant. If adopted, artificial analysis of the plan pervading the Gospel must follow—analysis obscure and shadowy. Each one of them is too narrow a bed to stretch the evangelical document on. To be adapted to any or all of them, violence must be done to it. A few expressions here and there are no good foundation for the assumption of designed antagonism in the body of the Gospel. *Purpose* in writing implies *a defined plan*, which will not lie hid from the reader throughout the greater part of the work; whereas, in the case of these hypotheses, it is very difficult to trace *continued antagonistic reference*. Truth is stated, propositions are advanced which *do* confute the errors mentioned, some of them constituting a very happy antithesis; but in the absence of other phenomena, it cannot be thence inferred, that it was John's design particularly to oppose those errors. We conclude then, that the object of the Gospel was not a doctrinal-polemic one. The author wrote expressly neither against heretical men nor false opinions.

ii. Others have supposed, that the Gospel before us was written with the view of supplying things wanting in the other three evangelists. John intended to complete the evangelical history by furnishing many additional events in the life of our Lord; and especially by relating many discourses omitted by the synoptists. This opinion is very ancient. It is found in Eusebius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Jerome. In modern times it has been adopted by Storr, Hug, Feilmoser, and others.

The words of Eusebius are[a]: "But after Mark and Luke had already published their Gospels, they say that John, who during all this time was proclaiming the Gospel without writing, at length proceeded to write it for the following reason:—The three Gospels previously written having been distributed among all, and also handed to him, they say that he admitted them, giving his testimony to their truth, but that there was only wanting in the narrative the account of the things done by Christ, among the first of his deeds, and at the commencement of the Gospel. And this

[a] H. E. iii. 24.

was the truth . . . . . For these reasons the apostle John, it is said, being entreated to undertake it, wrote the account of the time not recorded by the former evangelists, and the deeds done by our Saviour, which they have passed by (for these were the events that occurred before the imprisonment of the Baptist); and this very fact is intimated by him, when he says, 'this beginning of miracles Jesus made'; and then proceeds to make mention of the Baptist in the midst of our Lord's deeds, as John was at that time 'baptising at Aenon near Salim.' He plainly also shows this in the words, 'John was not yet cast into prison.' The apostle therefore, in his Gospel, gives the deeds of Jesus before the Baptist was cast into prison; but the other three evangelists mention the circumstances *after* that event. One who attends to these circumstances can no longer entertain the opinion that the Gospels are at variance with each other, as the Gospel of John comprehends the first events of Christ, but the others the history that took place at the latter part of the time. It is probable therefore, that for these reasons John has passed by in silence the genealogy of our Lord, because it was written by Matthew and Luke, but that he commenced with the doctrine of the divinity, as a part reserved for him by the divine Spirit, as if for a superior." The repetition of the word φασὶ in this paragraph shews, that the view here given by Eusebius was older than his time. It was a report or a tradition. The proof of it drawn from the Gospel itself is obviously weak. No authority can be attached to an opinion thus handed down by the historian with the insufficient traditional evidence adduced.

To the same effect writes Theodore of Mopsuestia: "The Christians of Asia having a great opinion of the abilities and faithfulness of John, and considering that he had been with Jesus from the beginning even before Matthew, and that he had been greatly favoured by the Lord, brought to him the other books of the Gospels, desiring to know his opinion concerning them. And he declared his approbation of them, saying, that what they had written was agreeable to truth; but that some miracles, which might be of great use if recorded, were omitted. He said moreover, that whereas they had written of the coming of Christ in the flesh, it was fit that the things concerning his divinity also

should be recorded. The brethren thereupon earnestly desired him to write those things which he esteemed needful to be known, and which he saw to have been omitted by the rest: with which request he complied[b]." Here the tradition has received a somewhat different form.

Jerome was the means of establishing the tradition in the West. "Another reason of his (John's) writing is also mentioned; which is, that after having read the volumes of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, he expressed his approbation of their history as true, but observed, that they had recorded an account of but one year of our Lord's ministry, even the last, after the imprisonment of John, in which year also he suffered. Omitting therefore that year, the history of which had been written by the other three, he related the acts of the preceding time before John was shut up in prison, as may appear to those who read the volumes of the four evangelists; which may serve to account for the seeming difference between John and the rest[c]."

According to this hypothesis, the apostle had the three Gospels before him, and studiously wrote with the view of supplementing them. Those who desire to see an ingeniously elaborate attempt to establish it, may peruse Hug's introduction, where all that acuteness could supply is brought together in its favour. But although it is manifest that John has generally related discourses and miracles of Christ omitted by his predecessors, yet weighty considerations, unfavourable to the hypothesis, will readily suggest themselves to the inquirer.

1. John has many things in common with the other evangelists, such as

John	Luke	Mark	Matt.
ii. 16.	xix. 46.	xi. 17.	xxi. 13.
iii. 35.	—	—	—
v. 20.	x. 22.	—	xi. 27.
viii. 19.			
x. 15.	—	—	—
iv. 35.	—	—	ix. 37, etc.
iv. 44.	—	—	xiii. 57.
vi. 5, etc.	—	—	xiv. 15; etc.
vi 16, etc.	—	—	xiv. 22, etc.

[b] See Corderii Catena in Joan. p. 706.

[c] Catalog. Scriptor. Ecclesiast. c. 9.

John	Luke	Mark	Matt.
xii. 7. 8.	Luke	Mark	Matt. xxvi. 11. 12.
xii. 25.	—	—	xvi. 25; x. 39.
xiii. 20.	x. 16.	—	x. 40.
xiv. 13.	—	—	xviii. 19, etc.
xvii. 2.	—	—	xxviii. 18, etc.
xviii. 10.	—	—	xxvi. 51, etc.

2. We should have expected, and it is quite probable, that John would have stated this in the introduction or close of his Gospel. When he was writing the words in xx. 31, it could scarcely have been avoided.

3. The narratives of the apostle differ so much from those of the synoptists, especially in regard to the scene and duration of Christ's ministry, as even to assume the appearance of being contradictory. The first three confine his ministry almost wholly to Galilee, while John places it in Judea. They mention but one journey to Jerusalem before the crucifixion; while he gives a successive account of several. Thus they materially disagree in fixing the duration of his public employment. Surely there is no appearance in this of supplying the defects of the evangelists, in the absence too of the least hint of it. The fact must rather have perplexed his readers. Doubtless the writer would have avoided these discrepancies, or at least have obviated misapprehension on the part of his readers, by plainly declaring his purpose.

4. The Gospel bears internal evidence of being an original work, complete in itself, without direct or indirect relation to any others. It has no discernible supplementary character.

5. Were this hypothesis true, we should have expected John to retouch and illustrate several things left indefinite or obscure in the synoptists. For example, the sermon on the mount, which greatly requires definiteness, would probably have been noticed.

6. Not only is it incapable of proof, but improbable, that the synoptical Gospels could have been so commonly and widely circulated in the time of John as this hypothesis presupposes. The early churches were then instructed in Christianity not so much by written documents, as by oral tradition. They could scarcely have been familiar with the life and work of the Redeemer from perusal of the former. They were, for the most part, dependent on oral communications; and to suppose the Churches of Ephesus

conversant with the written synoptists, or that John himself had seen them, is to assume what cannot be proved.

On the whole, we are justified in pronouncing the hypothesis in question unsupported either by external tradition, or internal grounds. In that case the Gospel must have assumed a different character and form. Some truth lies at the basis of it, as we shall see hereafter; but when propounded as a specific object, it must be rejected.

Had the apostle then, it may be asked, any subordinate design in writing his Gospel, besides that general object which he has himself stated? Was there any special motive, more than the divine impulse acting on his own spirit, and the counsel of friends, which induced him to undertake the task? We have seen that his object was *didactic*. He wished to prove that Jesus was the Messiah by adducing acts and discourses which elevated Him far above humanity to the rank of the divine. But in doing so, we must look at the circumstances under which he wrote, the time and place in which he lived, the current modes of thought prevalent in Asia Minor, especially in regard to Christianity, the dangers to which the believers were exposed, and the aspects of cultivated mind in that region. In short, all the influences which mould to a greater or less extent the individuality of a writer, must be looked at by him who would take a proper survey of the Gospel. The subjective views of the apostle were affected by the phenomena around him;—and the combined circumstances that shaped his mental habitudes must be attended to by such as would obtain a comprehensive and accurate view of the nature of his work. The age in which he lived, as well as the scenes of his ministrations, had its own characteristics. Philosophical and theological elements were incorporated into the creed of many. Certain wants were felt. Speculations of a particular kind were afloat. Christian faith was exposed to perils which none other century has exhibited in the same form. Cultivated intellect presented peculiar phases. The religion of Christ had attained a certain stage of development, awaiting farther unfolding. And that the apostle should have been perfectly indifferent to these things is incredible. No doubt, it was his great object to present Christian truth in its purity; but his modes of thought had been

fashioned by all he came into contact with; and he was therefore unavoidably led to such an exhibition of that truth as should bear the impress of surrounding influences. No adequate purpose to write a Gospel can be conceived, without some reference to the prevailing phenomena of mind, which it was his great business to guide and elevate. And then the conformation of the Gospel itself justifies this view. If it does not bear the evidence of direct, specific antagonism to one or more theoretic tendencies of the day, it contains at least indirect allusions more or less prominent to intellectual manifestations amid which the writer lived. While his design was to promote a living faith in Jesus, there are perceptible indications of his having done so with occasional reference to the state of Christianity in Asia Minor. He presents the Messiah in another aspect than that in which he appears in the synoptists—an aspect elicited by, and adapted to, the wants of the age.

We allow that there is a danger here of over-estimating the influences of surrounding mental tendencies on the apostle, and of representing the Gospel as *mainly* moulded to meet them. His spirit was not so open to the power of external causes as are the passive minds which we observe every day. The life and doctrines of Christ had penetrated deeply into his soul. He drew therefore his essential ideas from a living consciousness in himself, independently of current notions. His own experience of the Redeemer, as the exhaustless source of faith and love, was so firmly grounded as to prove a strong barrier against the pressure of modes of thought from without. He was not *largely* affected by the speculations of others. Contemplative in character, he looked within—he meditated—he reflected; and though by no means insensible to what was passing around, he was less so than most of his fellow-apostles would have been in the same circumstances. We must therefore be careful of not attributing too much of John's mental idiosyncrasy to the varied influences of his day; else we shall bring into his work a polemic reference and a purely human element, which its nature does not warrant. His mind was too spiritual to allow *an undue* infusion of the wisdom of men however refined and just, or in whatever garb it might be clothed. Converse with Christ had furnished him with enduring materials of thought, life, and love.

It is matter of regret that we possess so few materials for judging of the state of Ephesus and its vicinity at the time of John. Here history forsakes us. The materials at our disposal are very meagre. Minute circumstances, affording presumption of particular phenomena, constitute almost the entire stock of our knowledge. Those who look for *distinct* or *definite* evidence of marked characteristics, will be disappointed. But though the field be obscure, it is incumbent on us to gather from it all that can tend to throw any light on the origin or nature of the sacred document. Unsatisfactory as they may be, the points pertinent to our purpose are not to be neglected.

Even before the appearance of Jesus on earth, *the elements* of gnosis were in operation, both among the Jews and the heathen. It consisted of a mixture of Oriental theosophy and Grecian philosophy, caused by the striving of the unsatisfied soul after an absolute, universal religion. Among the Jews, we perceive the first historic development of this gnosis in Alexandrian Judaism, of which Philo is the best representative. When Christianity arose out of Judaism, it is natural to suppose that the Jewish Gnostics would pass over to the side of it, embracing it as more satisfactory to the longing spirit. But the speculative tendency which characterised them soon exerted an unfavourable influence on the new religion. Jewish gnosis endeavoured to subordinate the revelation of Christ to itself, corrupting it with an admixture of its own elements. We see, from Paul's epistles, that he had encountered the Judaising gnosis in question in various parts of Asia Minor, especially at Colosse. One of the points with which it was occupied was the relation of the hidden Deity to the revelation of Himself in Christ; and how the union of the divine and human in the person of Jesus Christ was to be understood. Cerinthus may be taken as the representative of a Christian gnosis developed out of Judaism, in the time of the apostle John. He was a contemporary; and tradition goes so far as to state, that John encountered him personally. From early writers we discover two leading points of his belief with tolerable certainty. He maintained that there was no essential, indissoluble connection between the Logos and the humanity of Jesus. He denied the original indwelling of the Divine Being in Him, holding no more

than a *transient* relation formed at His baptism by the descent of the Highest Aeon, which left Him again at the beginning of His sufferings. Besides, his views of the Old and New Testaments were inadequate, since in both revelations he did not recognise the immediate agency of Deity, but an intermediate ministration of angels, to which he referred them — the old revelation to a lower aeon or spirit — the Christian revelation to the highest aeon.

But there was another direction of false gnosis, in which the Logos was supposed to be revealed in humanity without the intervention of a human being, having been enshrined only in the semblance of a body. The Aeon Christ employed an optical illusion, that he might in some way be cognisable by the senses, since he could not be so in his own nature. This was the *docetic* tendency, which wholly denied the humanity of the Redeemer. The latter idealism was the opposite of that Ebionite tendency, which contented itself with a materialism rising no higher than the Saviour's external human appearance; and the Cerinthian view formed an intermediate step between them. This material Ebionitism had not passed away at the time of the apostle, although speculation generally had attained the transition-point of the Cerinthian doctrine, as well as the farther idealism of the Docetæ. There was still the Jewish, one-sided, sensuous tendency that would not recognise the supernatural in Christ.

Amid the breaking up of old systems, the human mind had received an impulse which manifested itself in a variety of ways. Established opinions did not satisfy inquiry. Human authority was cast off. Speculation had been awakened. There was a longing after an absolute philosophy in religion — a craving desire to know more than what is attainable by human imperfection. Christianity had found its way into the circles of the cultivated, giving rise to doubts and difficult questions, not only among those who received it, but among the unbelieving also. Objections had risen in the minds of many, in consequence of the starting-point which the new religion had furnished them with. A class of believers were not able to satisfy their own minds, much less the minds of others, on many things apparently mysterious, unintelligible, or inconsistent. The current evangelical tradition did

not afford a satisfactory solution of such difficulties. It gave repose to those who entertained a simple, living faith in the Redeemer, without presenting an adequate resting-point to the researches of others who looked into the grounds and reasons of its doctrinal revelations. Embracing the rudiments of the new religion, it did not contain the higher or abstruser parts of it.

It is true that some of Paul's epistles were known and circulated in that part of Asia Minor. Especially was the circle in which the apostle's influence was immediately felt, familiar with the letter that had been addressed to the *Ephesian* church. The Colossian epistle, too, must have been well known. But these epistles, superinduced on the oral evangelical history which the first three Gospels exclusively contain, probably astonished the minds of the believers, or overawed them with the mysterious, much more than they satisfied. The step from the one to the other was too great—the interval too wide, to impart repose easily or soon. The evangelical history, in another aspect of it, needed completion, before these epistles could be seen in all their symmetry and adaptation to the spiritual aspirations of sincere inquirers, at every stage of their advancement.

In regard to the precise points of difficulty which would obstruct the progress of Christianity with many, we are unable to form any probable opinion. The person of the Redeemer, His relation to the Father, His atonement, the reception He met with from His own countrymen, the certainty of His apostles knowing and teaching the truth after His ascension, these and kindred points probably presented the greatest perplexity to theoretic inquirers, and were therefore a stumbling-block to the progress of the Gospel among the churches superintended by John. It were easy to adduce particular portions of the book which seem to have indirect reference to these peculiarities; but much uncertainty rests on the fact of their having been designedly written to meet the gropings and to quiet the scruples of uneasy minds. The passages may be explained apart from the circumstances in question. Conjecture alone is all that can be put forth by persons attempting to account for the introduction of certain topics in the form they bear in the Gospel, from doubts entertained regarding them within the sphere of the writer's labours. When we consider the state of

philosophy and religion about Ephesus—the Hellenistic culture of many—the extent to which the Christian faith had been embraced—the length of time it had been known and felt—the theoretic tendencies of Judaising gnostics, and of Christian gnostics too—the nature of the human mind itself stimulated by the new ideas—the incompleteness of the common evangelical tradition relating to the historic events of Christ's life—it is not improbable that considerable aspirations after a fuller representation of the essence of Christianity were felt by many reflecting Christians. Doubtless there were not a few whose minds having been enlightened by the writings of Paul, but not wholly relieved of uncertainty, yearned after a more comprehensive acquaintance with the connection and unity of Christian doctrine, a better apprehension of the divine and the human in this latest revelation, and a higher contemplation of the remoter facts in their essential oneness. And it is precisely in this region they would be exercised with perplexing anomalies, which the oral and written revelations they had did not solve. Here their minds would be restless; while the speculative spirits of many around them would be prevented from adopting Christianity because of its not affording a many-sided view in the region where they loved to wander. Unable to perceive the natural limits of human knowledge, or the essential nature of the Christian religion itself, theosophic heathens hesitated to give their assent to the latter; while it made but little progress among those who, having been acquainted with the essential truths, longed for an unfolding of them suited to their higher musings—or at least for such aspects of them as should calm the inquietude of their bosoms. It is only to the gnosis of the country where John wrote, and the time in which he lived, that we can, with any degree of probability, refer some parts of the Gospel. Not that there is any distinct or designed antagonism to it, either in the form maintained by Cerinthus in particular, or by the Docetae. It had not then developed itself fully. It was undergoing the process of unfolding, though even then injuriously operating, and threatening in its aspect towards Christianity. The mind of an apostle saw it in all its danger; but he did not purpose to write a polemical Gospel against it. Neither the character of his mind, nor the nature of *a Gospel*, were in harmony with a

polemical treatise. He determined to state the historic truths concerning Jesus, from the depths of personal consciousness, in a didactic mode, which would prove a sufficient antidote to the danger. In the narrative of Christ's life and discourses, he could make a selection that might serve effectually to counteract the aspects of a false gnosis, while it should eminently conduce to the furtherance of faith and love in their highest exercise. He meant, if it were possible, to turn the gnosis into a safe channel—to give it a better direction than that which it had taken in his day—to gain it over to the side of a true Christianity, where it should find a congenial element to move in, himself furnishing that element. We need not, therefore, look for an open confronting of gnosticism. Paul had already opposed it unequivocally, in conformity with the character of his mind.

The prologue of the Gospel obviously presents an allusion to the gnosis of John's day. The commencement of it appears to have a class of men in view who, by peculiar speculations, threatened to corrupt pure Christianity. The leading idea of it is therefore antignostic. The ever-existing Logos, the only-begotten of the Father, became incarnate, and sojourned truly among men. In His person, the human and divine are inseparably united. To Him the revelations of Deity in the world must be referred as their source. He has always been the Divine Light, to which the darkness of the world is opposed, and by which it is overcome. If we regard the prologue as giving the *key-note* to the entire Gospel, it may be affirmed that the tendency of the work was to counteract *indirectly* the false gnosis then current. But perhaps this is too strong an assertion to apply to the introduction, since a reference to such speculations is only apparent in it. An antignostic spirit pervades the Gospel, not because John's *design* was to furnish a *direct antidote* to it, but because his object was so general as naturally to include it. He purposed to write a Gospel consisting of history and doctrine, which should promote and strengthen faith in Christ as the Son of God, shewing the animating principles and consolations of that faith in their holy power of love. In doing so, he did not entirely overlook the speculations which mistook the nature of true faith, and were therefore injurious to Christianity; but he did not intend to refute them

specially. The character of his Gospel, we repeat, is not *polemic*. It is only *apologetic*. All the polemics of it appear in the mild form of narrative and statement—a narrative of great facts, a statement of sublime utterances, that disprove *all* religious error; though their antithesis to the current error of that day is more discernible. We believe that he had certain mental tendencies in his view in the prologue, and probably in other parts of the Gospel; but these did not constitute the chief motive for writing it. They were subordinate to a more comprehensive design, and largely absorbed in it.

It is also possible that the apostle may have had an Ebionite tendency in view in several passages that are opposed to *it*, but the design is not apparent. We know that the apostle of the Gentiles had to contend with the elements of Ebionitism. This form of error adhered to the law with a tenacity incapable of ascending to any thing ideal, and therefore to pure Mosaism itself. Allied to Gnosticism in one sense, it was directly the opposite of it in another. Perhaps the false gnosis arose in part from a reaction, *the ideal* being opposed to *the carnal*. In the time of the apostle, the former tendency had not wholly overcome the latter. Jewish habits of thought still continued, which adhered to *the outward*.

These observations will serve to shew how much truth lies in the views of those who think that the apostle wrote in opposition to Gnosticism, Docetism, and Ebionitism. The authors who include them *all*, are nearer the right opinion than those who look to *one* exclusively. It is wrong to assert that John undertook his Gospel with a distinct, definite object against them, else that object would have moulded it in such a manner as to bring out strong points of antithesis. *Designed* polemical opposition to one, or to all of them, does not lie in the contents of the sacred book itself. And yet it is true that these injurious influences were not unnoticed by John. He intended to set forth Christian faith alone; and in doing so has written passages that *do* confute those erroneous tendencies. All *polemic* design is kept in the back ground. It is nowhere prominent or apparent. The prologue evinces an *apologetic* motive as dictating it; but in other places, designed references to heresies cannot be discovered. What he writes concerning Jesus *is* opposed to the dangerous specula-

tions of his day; but yet his view in writing rose far above and beyond a motive so narrow, and apparently unworthy of him. He draws forth truth from the depths of his own consciousness and feeling; but that consciousness had been affected, though not injuriously, by the theoretic propensities with which he had come into contact, so that he could not avoid *all* allusion to current views. As a guardian of the faith, he could not be an unconcerned spectator of the speculations afloat in Ephesus and its vicinity, especially as they seemed likely to adulterate religion, and disturb the love of the Christians. Hence a tacit antagonism to the errors of his time lies in the selection of facts and discourses in the life of Jesus which he makes. These facts and discourses were chosen out of the mass because they were adapted to a great design—that design embracing within itself statements which would necessarily refute, in the form of simple affirmation, Gnosticism, Docetism, and Ebionitism.

In regard to the supplementary hypothesis, some truth also lies at the basis of it, though when propounded as *the design* of the apostle, it must be rejected. It is indeed incapable of proof that the Christians of Ephesus, or the circle of churches superintended by the apostle John, knew the first three Gospels; but it is certain they must have been acquainted with the evangelical traditions embodied in them. The life of Jesus was known to them. They had learned by oral instruction the events and discourses contained in the written Gospels. In his repeated discourses, the apostle must have mentioned many things not contained in the oral traditions lying at the basis of the synoptists. These he has incorporated in his Gospel. Hence he has supplied many events which the usual traditionary Gospel wanted. It is true that he has repeated some sections which they have, because without them the document would not have borne the character, or deserved the name of a complete Gospel; but the far greater part of it is *additional to* the narratives with which the Christians of Ephesus were already acquainted. Still however it was not the apostle's *object* to supplement the first three Gospels, even though he has adduced most important particulars connected with the Redeemer which truly supply omissions, and thereby render the evangelical history complete for all purposes of the Christian

life. The writer intentionally passed over many important facts in the life of Christ, because his readers were acquainted with the current traditions of which they formed a part; and by communicating other particulars, he has in *fact* filled up the circle of truths which the Deity intended to reveal as the basis of our religion.

It is of some importance not to attribute to the writer the prosecution of one or more definite objects more *specific* than he has himself warranted. Since the time of Strauss, the tendency to do so has been carried to an extreme. The consequence of this procedure is, that the production is made to assume a character of *artificiality* which certainly does not belong to it. Every minute circumstance narrated is brought to bear testimony to the author's *pervading* design—a design carried out into execution with an exactness of method and a logical precision evincing high philosophic culture. All this we believe to be far from the truth. But the design of those who represent the author of the Gospel to be possessed of a cast of mind so reflecting cannot be mistaken. The more Alexandrian culture is attributed to him—the more evidence of an artificial disposition of materials can be discovered—the greater is the improbability of a fisherman having composed it. We are fully persuaded that Baur has greatly misapprehended the mental idiosyncrasy of John, as it is observable in the Gospel. It is quite preposterous to introduce into his work a very high degree of reflectiveness; or the prosecution of an object so formally minute as a highly cultivated rhetorician of modern times would exhibit. Whoever reads the Gospel with simplicity of mind, will not fail to see that unity of purpose pervades it—a unity consistent only with simplicity; and that all the ingenious researches of Baur's school make the writer different from his real self, by transferring to him a large measure of their own elaboration. Hence he is highly dishonoured by the very praises of some theologians, their motive being perverse; and it is much to be regretted, that the influence of their writings on men disposed to uphold the Gospel's authenticity has been considerable. By lauding the writer, they have led theologians of a *conservative* tendency to follow them with an abatement of the praise—but yet with so small an abatement, as to leave an *undue* estimate of the sacred

writer behind it. Thus Reuss speaks of John's theology as able to unite *the highest abstractions of metaphysical speculation*, in happy combination with the inmost effusions of a glowing and tender mysticism[d]. A large proportion of what is termed *John's speculation and mysticism*, should be placed to the account of theologians who view his writings through the false medium of their own capricious philosophy.

V. Characteristics of the Gospel.

(*a*) The position occupied by the writer, and the point of view from which he surveys the evangelical history.

This has been already indicated in the course of the preceding observations, so that it would be superfluous to repeat what has been said. He lived in Asia Minor, as acknowledged Head of the churches belonging to the district where he resided. The Gospel history had long been current among the Christians of that region, at least in unwritten forms. Grecian culture had extended itself there. Hellenistic speculation was awake. Theosophy had appeared. Amid the various influences, he was led to select from the public life of our Lord such materials as appeared best adapted to prove Jesus to be the Messiah, the Son of God; and to connect with faith in Him the highest development of the human powers—the greatest amount of happiness, light, and love, to which the immortal spirit can aspire. We must therefore view the apostle as writing his Gospel about the close of the first century, after the leading historical events of Jesus' life were familiar to the Christians of Asia Minor, and some at least of Paul's epistles were known to them. At a period when Christianity had begun to unfold itself within the bosoms of the reflecting, giving rise to high imaginings, as well as perplexing ideas regarding the Deity and His manifestations, the apostle undertook to complete the evangelical history which forms the foundation of all that is true, by presenting Jesus in a higher light than the other evangelists—a light appropriate to the age. Hence some of the fathers applied the epithet *pneumatic* or spiritual (*πνευματικὸν*) to the work, in contradistinction to *carnal* (*σωματικὰ*), as descriptive of the *synoptical* Gospels.

[d] Die Geschichte der heilig. Schrift. p. 66.

(*b*) Plan.

It is uncertain whether the apostle John had a very *definite* or *systematic* plan in his mind when he began to write the Gospel, though he doubtless had a general idea of the course he should pursue. Perhaps he had merely conceived an arrangement in outline, rather than any systematised method regularly disposed in all its parts. This is the natural conclusion that suggests itself to the mind of a careful reader who has no preconceived theory to support, — who is under no temptation of introducing logical artificiality into the work, such as would bespeak an author deeply tinged with Alexandrian philosophy. But although no plan approaching to minute elaboration or presenting dialectic skill, can be found in the Gospel, yet the disposition of materials is far from arbitrary. In accordance with his purpose, the writer pursues a method which could not have been accidental, because it may be distinctly seen. The facts and doctrines are introduced in subservience to a certain design, and in a mode well fitted to subserve it. They are put together so as to shew that John had a plan agreeably to which he meant to make a selection from the history of Jesus' life. The materials did not lie in a confused heap in his mind when he began to compose the Gospel, evincing his want of mastery or power of management over them. He had the ability to wield and mould them after his own notions of propriety; and they have therefore been shaped in accordance with his main object, in the most intelligible, if not the most systematic form[e].

The work itself is naturally divided into two great parts, in which two aspects of the Redeemer's history are respectively presented. In the first, His public ministry is described so as to shew that though the glory of His person was recognised by many, He was not received by the majority of the Jewish nation, but encountered opposition and hatred. Believed on by some, He was rejected by the unbelieving world, who in the blindness of their understanding, failed to perceive the essential glory of His person—a glory that could not be concealed even by the lowly form assumed. In the second are detailed the mode in which He pursued the work by which the Father was glorified among

[e] See Baumgarten-Crusius, Einleit. p.36.

His disciples, in the near prospect of death, and His consequent glorification by the Father who raised Him from the dead. Though the fruits of His ministry were disbelief and rejection by the world who discerned not His majesty; yet He was eminently glorified in His death. These two parts embrace i. 19-xii, and xiii-xx.

The attentive reader of the latter part of the twelfth chapter will observe, how the history is gradually brought to a resting-point at that place. The visit of certain Greeks to Jerusalem, and their desire to see Jesus — which was an earnest and foreshadowing of the universal acceptance of His person, now partially recognised as the Messiah even by Gentiles—is purposely introduced. The fact in question is appropriately placed at the conclusion of His public ministry among men; and so far from being a fabrication on the part of the writer, it attests the authenticity of the Gospel. Hence Jesus declares, immediately after the visit of the Greeks, that the time appointed for the glorification of the Son was come—the time in which He should devote Himself to death for the salvation of the world, and be exalted to the right hand of the Father. Accordingly, an approving voice from Heaven attests the mode in which the preceding part of His ministry had been conducted, by proclaiming it as the means which God had employed for the glorification of His name. Such means were now to be laid aside. The ministry of Jesus, as hitherto conducted, was at an end. His public life was virtually terminated. The proper conclusion of the section is formed by the few verses, 37-43, which furnish the right point of view from which to look at the Jews' unbelief; while 44-50 are a condensed summary of the contents of all his past discourses.

Two subordinate portions may be distinguished in this division, viz i. 19-iv, and v.-xii. *The former* contains specimens of Jesus' ministry in Galilee, Judaea, and Samaria. Here his reception is favourable on the whole. He is generally recognised as the Messiah. *The latter* constitutes the turning-point of his active course. Here we begin to perceive the enmity of the Jews, and their steadily increasing hatred against him. In the one, he meets with little opposition—the peaceful prevails—Jesus obtains acceptance with the people; but in the other, a conflict between light and darkness commences — contradiction is offered — persecution

prevails over favour. The first section contains a very few intimations, such as ii. 13, iii. 1, etc., whence a collision might be anticipated; while in the second, the expected opposition appears in striking colours. Thus, at the beginning of the fifth chapter, there is a transition from the comparatively quiet scenes of his earlier ministry to events in which the Jewish leaders step forth in an attitude of bold antagonism. Hence chapters vii-xii. are a preparation for the catastrophe of his death during his last abode in Judea. The collision between him and the Jews grows more determined, so as to prepare the mind of the reader for the final issue.

The second part has also been subdivided by De Wette into two sections, viz. xiii-xvii., and xviii-xx.; but the transition from the one to the other is not very distinct or marked. At the commencement of the thirteenth chapter naturalness of sequence is sufficiently obvious. Jesus carries on that great work in which the Father is glorified, *among his disciples*, till his death; and at the eighteenth chapter it is related, how the Father begins to glorify the Son at the time of death itself. The Son had continued to glorify the Father on earth till death completes the work; and in the crisis of death, the Father glorifies the Son by raising Him from the dead. The eighteenth chapter begins to describe the glorification-work of the Father when the hour of death had arrived[f].

The *prologue* consists of the first eighteen verses, which form an introduction to the proper Gospel. Here we are at once raised to the true platform of observation, whence a correct survey of the actions, discourses, and fate of Jesus may be gained. It does not exhibit a condensed summary of the whole Gospel, as Baur and even Frommann suppose, but rather prepares the reader for the Gospel, giving him at the same time the spiritual result of its contents by pointing out the person of whom it treats, and placing him before the reader's view in a just light. It bears a similar relation to the Gospel which πίστις did to γνῶσις in the Christian school of Alexandria. The twenty-first chapter is an *appendix* to the Gospel.

[f] See Frommann in the Studien und Kritiken for 1840, 4tes Heft, pp. 882, 883; and his Johanneischer Lehrbegriff, p. 371 et seqq.

It will be observed, that the writer has expressly marked the Jewish festivals in the first leading division, i. 19-xii. Hence it has been supposed, that he arranged his materials in subservience to this chronological notification. But a closer examination will shew, that chronology was a minor point in the apostle's thoughts. It is an *external accompaniment* of the plan, not an *internal* or *essential* feature of it. In pursuing his great purpose, the apostle notes time and place as secondary circumstances naturally arising in the course of the narrative. They belong accordingly to the outward frame and form of the Gospel, not to its real structure. As far as the leading design of the author is concerned, they might have been absent without detriment, because they are of little significance in regard to it.

(*c*) Mode of narration.

The Gospel bears the stamp of originality. Individuality of character belongs to it. The narratives are marked by simplicity, vividness, and life. The descriptions are drawn from the heart of one who had seen and heard what he presents, with no common interest. Without aiming at ornament or effect, the work abounds in story which makes a more striking and durable impression on the mind than the cold manner of one whose soul had not been penetrated by the divine presence of the person delineated. Taken as a whole, the Gospel presents an unity and completeness betokening one author; and although that author possessed little dialectic skill, even had it been required for such a writing, yet the life-like scenes presented are highly graphic because of their truthful simplicity. The leading ideas of the Gospel are among the greatest that can possibly exercise a human spirit; yet they are clothed withal in a plain garb. No attempt to be eloquent in setting them forth, is visible: they are eloquently enunciated just because they are the natural emanation of a heart impregnated with their sanctifying influence. The apostle appears to have had little talent for vivid description of outward objects; yet his mode of delineating facts in the evangelical history has all the reality and effect of the graphic, because of the subduing artlessness belonging to it. He seems however to have excelled in natural reflectiveness, if we may form a conclusion from the discourses of Jesus, in connection with the ideas

appended to them, as elaborated apparently in the mind of the writer. He was not fitted for consecutive reasoning, like Paul; but for calm contemplation. He was not formed by nature for conducting lengthened processes of argumentation, linked together with metaphysical acuteness; but at the same time, his mind was deeply reflective, comprehensive in its range, able to bring together scattered materials, and to weave them into a web of wonderful, though inartificial texture. In short, his mode of narration is characterised by simplicity and tenderness, combining to produce an impression of power superior to any thing that could have been effected by graphic elaborateness. He is graphic because he is natural.

Much has been written concerning *the mysticism* of John, as it appears in the Gospel. Without entering at length into a consideration of the point, it may be stated generally, that it has been too largely assigned to the philosophy of the period. Alexandrian theosophy has been investigated to little purpose, in order to account for what is termed the mysticism of John. The ideas respecting Deity developed in the work; the inadequacy of language to describe relations in the Godhead apart from metaphor, the sublimity of the subject being too vast to find a fitting vehicle of human material; those spiritual connexions of which the writer speaks which are necessarily obscure to the finite understanding; and a cognate, allegorical spirit pervading many of the Jewish writings, will serve to explain the shadowy dimness encircling some portions of the Gospel. Perhaps the writer's mental temperament led him to adventure occasionally into the region of uncreated spirit, as he meditated on the wondrous person of the Redeemer, and the still more marvellous, though partial revealings of His essential nature which He deigned to make in the days of his flesh. The abstract spirituality of the leading ideas, as expressed in the prominent terms of the Gospel, must be regarded as the main source of that mystic colouring, which some critics have greatly exaggerated. Who can presume to look into the pavilion of the uncreated glory, without being dazzled and bewildered? Or who may apprehend and lucidly express the secret relations of Father, Son, and Spirit?

(*d*) Style and diction.

It is needless to allude to the opinion of those who suppose that the Gospel was originally written in Aramaean, since the notion is founded on an assumption long since disproved. The Greek language was not uncommon in Palestine in the time of Christ; so that it is both possible and probable that John acquired it in his own country. And even if he had been previously unacquainted with it, he must soon have learned it at Ephesus, from daily intercourse with the inhabitants. The Greek originality of the Gospel may be regarded as certain. No unbiassed reader in perusing it will be impressed with any other idea.

The style is characterised by softness, ease, and simplicity. The diction is comparatively pure. It has been pronounced indeed *strongly Hebraic;* but *all* Hellenistic Greek has a Hebrew basis; and John's has undoubtedly far less colouring of that nature than many parts of the New Testament. Genuine Greek expressions, as well as the peculiar constructions of classical Greek, are by no means rare. The Hebrew character of the style appears particularly from the manner in which sentences are connected. Instead of the language being *periodic*, like that of Paul who developes his materials in a dialectic form, John puts together the matter of the evangelical history with great simplicity, placing successive ideas in juxtaposition, rather than logical connexion. He generally connects verses and sentences by *καὶ*, *οὖν* and *δέ*. In this respect he is unlike the apostle of the Gentiles. Doubtless he wrote thus from mental idiosyncrasy: and it is this very method which gives his style a Hebraic character; while the Greek is more predominant in Paul, from the fact of his writing in a periodic form because of the logical unfolding of his ideas. John's style is not elegant, but plain, and tolerably free from Hebraisms. He writes good Hellenistic Greek, though it be inferior, in some respects, to that of Luke.

His stock of words seems not to have been copious. There is no manifold variety of diction. The same terms and phrases are repeated, indicating paucity of linguistic materials. He had not great or absolute mastery of the Greek language, though always employing appropriate terms to express his ideas. Even great

conceptions, difficult to be embodied in fitting diction, are symbolised in intelligible and suitable terms.

In delineating the chief peculiarities, we shall follow as before the synopsis given by Credner, who has embraced in it not only the Gospel, but the first epistle usually attributed to John.

1. *Ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν,* in the beginning of a discourse, i. 52; iii. 3, 5; v. 19, 24, 25; vi. 26, 32, 47, 53; viii. 34, 51, 58; x. 1, 7; xii. 24; xiii. 16, 20, 21, 38; xiv. 12; xvi. 20, 23; xxi. 18.

2. In quotations from the Old Testament, *ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος,* or *ἡ γραφή,* xii. 38; xiii. 18; xv. 25; xvii. 12; xviii. 9; xix. 24, 36.

3. Peter is called either *Σίμων Πέτρος,* i. 41; vi. 8, 68; xiii. 6, 9, 24, 36; xviii. 10, 15, 25; xx. 2, 6; xxi. 2, 3, 11, 15; or *Πέτρος* alone, i. 45; xiii. 8, 37; xviii. 11, 16, 17, 18, 26, 27; xx. 3, 4; xxi. 7, 20, 21. *Σίμων* never occurs except in i. 42, 43.

4. *Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος,* xi. 16; xx. 24; xxi. 2.

5. John the Baptist is called simply *Ἰωάννης,* and is never indicated minutely by the epithet *βαπτιστής* annexed, i. 6, 15, 19, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35, 41; iii. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27; iv. 1; v. 33, 36; x. 40, 41.

6. *Θαλάσση τῆς Τιβεριάδος,* in reference to the sea of Galilee, vi. 1; xxi. 1.

7. *Τεκνία* and *παιδία* in affectionate address; the former in xiii. 33. 1 John ii. 1, 12, 28; iii. 7, 18; iv. 4; v. 21. The latter in xxi. 5. 1 John ii. 13, 18.

8. *Ἴδε,* not *ἰδού,* i. 29, 36, 48; iii. 26; v. 14; vii. 26; xi. 3, 36; xii. 19; xvi. 29; xviii. 21; xix. 4, 5, 14. In xix. 26, 27, *ἴδε* is probably the right reading.

9. *Μετὰ ταῦτα,* and *μετὰ τοῦτο,* in general designations of time, ii. 12; iii. 22; v. 1, 14; vi. 1; vii. 1, 11; xi. 7; xiii. 7; xix. 28, 38; xxi. 1.

10. *Μέντοι,* iv. 27; vii. 13; xii. 42; xx. 5; xxi. 4.

11. *Οὐδέν* put after the verb, iii. 27; viii. 28; x. 41; xviii. 20; xxi. 3.

12. The use of *περὶ* is very frequent, especially after the verbs *μαρτυρεῖν, λέγειν, γογγύζειν, λαλεῖν,* and such like, i. 7, 8, 15, 22, 30, 48; ii. 21, 25; v. 31, 32, 36, 37, 39, 46; vi. 41, 61; vii. 7, 12, 13; xxi. 24, et pass. 1 John ii. 26; v. 9, 10, 16.

13. *Ὄνομα αὐτῷ*, i. 6; iii. 1; comp. xviii. 10.

14. *Ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* (not *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀν.*), v. 43; x. 25; xii. 13; xiv. 13, 14, 26, et pass.

15. Cases absolute, vi. 39; vii. 38; xvii. 2, etc.

16. The use of the optative is entirely discarded: It is found once in the received text, xiii. 24; but the reading should be *καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· εἶπε τίς ἐστι*, etc.; comp. i. 19; ix. 36; xxi. 12, 20.

17. *Τὴν ψυχὴν τιθέναι*, x. 11, 15, 17; xiii. 37, 38; xv. 13. 1 John iii. 16. Matthew and Mark have *τὴν ψυχὴν δοῦναι*.

18. *ὄχλος*, instead of *ὄχλοι* as the synoptists, v. 13; vi. 2, 5, 22, 24; vii. 12, 20, 31, 32, 40, 43, 49, et pass.

19. *παροιμία* is used for the *παραβολή* of the synoptists, x. 6; xvi. 25, 29.

20. *ὄψις*, for the synoptist *πρόσωπον*, vii. 24; xi. 44.

21. *τὰ ἴδια*, *home* or *dwelling*, i. 11; xvi. 32; xix. 27.

22. *πιάζειν*, vii. 30, 32, 44; viii. 20; x. 39; xi. 57; xxi. 3, 10.

23. The use of *θεᾶσθαι* and *θεωρεῖν* is very common, i. 14, 32, 38; ii. 23; iv. 19, 35; vi. 5, 19, 40, 62; vii. 3; viii. 10, 51; ix. 8; x. 12; xi. 45; xii. 19, 45; xiv. 17, 19; xvi. 10, 17, 19; xx. 6, 12, 14. 1 John i. 1; iii. 17; iv. 12, 14.

24. He uses only the perfect *ἑώρακα* of *ὁρᾶν*, i. 18, 34; iii. 11, 32; iv. 45; v. 37; vi. 2, 36, 46; viii. 38, 57; ix. 37; xiv. 7, 9. 1 John i. 1, 2, 3; iii. 6; iv. 20.

25. The use of *οὖν* as a connecting particle is very frequent, such as vi. 5, 10, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 24, 28, 30, 32, 34, 41, 42, 43, 45, 52, 53, 60, 62, 67, 68; xi. 3, 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 31, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, 45, 47, 53, 54, 56; xxi. 5, 6, 7, 9, 13, 15, 23.

26. The narrative is also continued by the use of *ἵνα*. Comp. vi. 5, 7, 15, 28, 29, 30, 38, 40, 50; xi. 4, 11, 15, 16, 19, 31, 42, 50, 52, 53, 55, 57; xii. 7, 9, 10, 20, 23, 36, 38, 47, et pass. 1 John i. 3, 4, 9; ii. 1, 19, 27, 28, et pass. The construction *οὗτος—ἵνα*, is especially worthy of notice, i. 7; iv. 47; vi. 50; ix. 2; xi. 37, etc.

27. The antithetic *ἀλλά* occurs very frequently, vi. 9, 22, 26, 27, 32, 36, 38, 39, 64; vii. 10, 12, 16, 22, 24, 27, 28, 44, 59; viii. 12, 16, et pass. 1 John ii. 2, 7, 16, 19, 21, 27, etc. *ἀλλ' ἵνα* are often joined together, i. 8, 31; iii. 17; ix. 3; xi. 52; xii.

9, 47; xiii. 18; xiv. 31; xv. 25; xvii. 15; xviii. 28; vi. 38. 1 John ii. 27.

28. Sentences are loosely joined together by *καὶ*, i. 1, 14, 31-34, 36, 37; ii. 1-3, 8, 12-16; v. 9; vii. 1, 28; ix. 1, 2, 6; x. 40-42, et pass. Periods very often commence without any connecting particle, i. 40, 41, 46; v. 14; vii. 32; ix. 35; xii. 22; xvi. 19; xviii. 24, 25.

29. There is a frequent repetition of the same expressions, immediately after, in the same sentence, as i. 7, 8, 14; iii. 11, 17, 33, 34; v. 31-39, 41-44; viii. 13, 14, 17, 18; x. 17, 18; xiv. 13; xvii. 6; xviii. 15, 16; xix. 35; xxi. 24. 1 John i. 2; v. 9, 10, 11, et pass.

The following are peculiar constructions: *ποιήσατε ἀναπεσεῖν— ἀνέπεσον οὖν*, vi. 10. *συναγάγετε — συνήγαγον οὖν*, vi. 12, 13. *κλαίουσα ἔξω — ὡς οὖν ἔκλαιε*, xx. 11. *βάλετε οὖν — ἔβαλον οὖν*, xxi. 6. *τοῦτο εἶπε — καὶ τοῦτο εἰπών*, xxi. 19.

30. John first expresses an idea positively, and then negatively, i. 3, 6, 7, 20, 48; iii. 15, 17, 20; iv. 42; v. 19, 24; viii. 35, 45, ff.; x. 28; xv. 5, 6, 7. 1 John ii. 27, et pass.

31. We find great definiteness in the statement of times and numbers, as i. 29, 35, 40, 44; ii. 1; iii. 1; iv. 40, 43; vi. 22; vii. 14, 37; xi. 6, 9, 17; xii. 6, 12; xx. 19, 26; xxi. 4.

32. References to what had been already related are common, as in iv. 54; vi. 23, 71; vii. 50; x. 40; xviii. 9, 14, 26; xix. 39; xxi. 14, 20.

33. The author frequently adds explanatory remarks of his own to something just narrated, as i. 39, 42, 43; ii. 6, 9, 21, 24, 25; iii. 19-21, 24; iv. 2, 6, 9, 25, 45; vi. 6, 10, 22, 33, 64, 71; vii. 5, 22, 39; viii. 27; ix. 7; x. 6; xi. 13, 30, 51, 52; xii. 6, 16, 33, 38-41; xiii. 2, 11, 28, 29; xiv. 22; xv. 26; xvii. 22; xviii. 5, 9; xix. 5, 30, 31, 38; xx. 16; xxi. 7, 8, 11, 19, 23, 25.

34. The apostle often uses *the historical present* for greater vividness of description, i. 29, 40, 42, 43, 44; v. 14; ix. 13; xi. 29; xviii. 28; xix. 9; xx. 6, 12, 14, 19, 26; xxi. 9.

It is manifest to every reader, that a series of leading terms and phrases is peculiar to this writer, expressive of cardinal ideas in his theology. These constitute his own terminology, by means of

which he stands out with a distinctive character among the New Testament writers, and are such as,

35. *κόσμος*, i. 9, 10, 29; iii. 16, 17; iv. 42; vi. 14, 33, 51; vii. 4, 7; viii. 12, 23, 26; ix. 5, 39, et pass. 1 John ii. 2, 15, 16, 17; iii. 1, 13, 17; iv. 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 17; v. 4, 5, 19.

36. *σάρξ*, i. 13, 14; iii. 6; vi. 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 63; viii. 15; xvii. 2. 1 John ii. 16; iv. 2, 3.

37. *ἁμαρτία*, i. 29; viii. 21, 24, 34, 46; ix. 34, 41; xv. 22, 24; xvi. 8, 9; xix. 11; xx. 23. 1 John i. 7-9; ii. 2, 12; iii. 4, 5, 8, 9; iv. 10; v. 16, 17.

38. *θάνατος*, v. 24; viii. 51, 52. 1 John iii. 14; v. 16, 17.

39. *σκότος*, iii. 19. 1 John i. 6.

40. *σκοτία*, i. 5; vi. 17; viii. 12; xii. 35, 46; xx. 1. 1 John i. 5; ii. 8, 9, 11. *περιπατεῖν ἐν τῷ σκότει, τῇ σκοτίᾳ*, xii. 35, et pass. *τῇ νυκτί*, xi. 10.

41. *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11. *πατὴρ ὁ διάβολος ὁ ἀνθρωπόκτονος*, viii. 44.

42. *ὁ οὐρανός*, i. 32, 52; iii. 13, 27, 31; vi. 31, 32, 33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51, 58; xii. 28; xvii. 1. 1 John v. 7.

43. *Θεὸς ὁ ἀληθινός*, vii. 28; xvii. 3. 1 John v. 20.

44. *ὁ λόγος*, i. 1-14; *ἡ δόξα, παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ*, and similar expressions, i. 14; ii. 11; v. 44; vii. 18; viii. 50, 54; xi. 4, 40; xvii. 4, 5, 22, 24. *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*, i. 14, 18; iii. 16, 18. 1 John iv. 9.

45. *Τὸ φῶς*, i. 4, 5, 7, 8, 9; iii. 19, 20, 21; v. 35; viii. 12; ix. 5; xi. 9, 10; xii. 36, 46. 1 John i. 5, 7; ii. 8, 9, 10.

46. *ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, i. 4; iii. 15, 16, 36; iv. 14, 36; v. 24, 26, 29, 39, 40; vi. 27, 33, 35, 40, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 63, 68; viii. 12; x. 10, 28; xi. 25; xii. 25, 50; xiv. 6; xvii. 2, 3; xx. 31. 1 John i. 1, 2; ii. 25; iii. 14, 15; v. 11-20.

47. *ἡ ἀλήθεια*, i. 14, 17; iii. 21; iv. 24; v. 33; viii. 32, 40, 44, 45, 46; xiv. 6, 17; xvi. 7, 13; xvii. 17, 19; xviii. 37, 38. 1 John i. 6, 8; ii. 4, 21; iii. 18, 19; iv. 6; v. 6.

48. *ἡ ἀγάπη*, v. 42; xv. 9, 10, 13; xvii. 26. 1 John iii. 17; iv. 7, 8, 9, 12, 16; v. 3.

49. *ὁ Σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου ὁ Χριστός*, iv. 42. 1 John iv. 14.

50. *φανερόω*, i. 31; ii. 11; iii. 21; vii. 4; ix. 3; xvii. 6; xxi. 1, 14. 1 John i. 2; ii. 19, 28; iii. 2, 5, 8, 9.

51. *φαίνει*, i. 5; v. 35. 1 John ii. 8.

52. *φωτίζειν*, i. 9.

53. *καταβαίνειν*, i. 32, 33, 52; iii. 13; vi. 33, 38, 42, 50, 51, 58.

54. *ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, viii. 42; xiii. 3; xvi. 28.

55. *ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον, εἰς τὰ ἴδια*, i. 7, 9, 11; iii. 19; vi. 14; ix. 39; xi. 27, et pass. *ἔρχεσθαι ἐν σάρκι*, 1 John iv. 2, 3.

56. *αἴρειν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου*, i. 29. *καθαρίζειν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀδικίας, ἁμαρτίας*, 1 John i. 7, 9.

57. *ζωὴν διδόναι τῷ κόσμῳ*, vi. 33.

58. *ὁδός*, i. 23; xiv. 4, 5, 6.

59. *ὁ κόσμος λαμβάνει — οὐ λαμβάνει*, xiv. 17; i. 12, 16; iii. 27, 32, 33; v. 34; xvi. 14, 15, 20. 1 John iii. 22.

60. *ἡ κρίσις, κρίνειν*, iii. 17, 18, 19; v. 22-30; xii. 31, 47.

61. *ζωοποιεῖν*, v. 21; vi. 63.

62. *γινώσκειν* and *πιστεύειν*, x. 38; xvii. 8. *γινώσκειν*, i. 10; vi. 69; vii. 17; viii. 32; x. 38; xvii. 3, 7. *πιστεύειν*, i. 7, 12; iii. 15—18, 36; vi. 40, 47; xi. 25, 26, et pass. 1 John iii. 23; v. 1-18.

63. *γεννηθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἄνωθεν*, i. 13; iii. 3, 5, 6, 7, 8. 1 John ii. 29; iii. 9; iv. 7; v. 1, 4, 18.

64. *τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ*, i. 12; xi. 52. 1 John iii. 1, 2, 10.

65. *ἀγαπᾶν Θεόν, τὸν πατέρα, τὸν Χριστόν, τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ἀλλήλους*, viii. 42; xiii. 34; xiv. 15, 21, 23, 24, 28; xv. 12, 17, et pass. 1 John ii. 10; iii. 10, 11, 14; iv. 7, 10, 11, 19, 20, 21; v. 2.

66. *κοινωνίαν ἔχειν μετὰ Θεοῦ, μετὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μετ' ἀλλήλων*, 1 John i. 3, 6, 7.

67. *νικᾶν τὸν κόσμον, τὸν πονηρόν*, xvi. 33. 1 John ii. 13, 14; v. 4, 5.

68. *μεταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου*, v. 24. 1 John iii. 14.

69. *περιπατεῖν, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἐν τῷ φωτί*, xi. 9. 1 John i. 7.

70. *ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ πλάνος*, 1 John ii. 18, 22; iv. 3, 6.

71. *ὁ παράκλητος*, xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7. 1 John ii. 1. *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας*, xiv. 17; xv. 26; xvi. 13. 1 John iv. 6; v. 6.

72. *ὁδηγεύειν*, xvi. 13.

73. *ἡμέρα ἐσχάτη*, vi. 39, 40, 44, 54; xi. 29; xii. 48.

74. *ἀναστῆναι*, vi. 39, 40, 44, 54; xi. 24. *ἀνάστασις ζωῆς, κρίσεως*, v. 29; xi. 24, 25.

75. *μένειν ἐν τινί*, v. 38; vi. 56; viii. 31; xii. 46; xiv. 11; xv. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16. 1 John ii. 6, 10, 14, 24, 27, 28; iii. 6, 9, 14, 15, 17, 24; iv. 12, 13, 15, 16.

76. *εἶναι ἐκ, ἐν*, iii. 6, 31; iv. 22; vi. 58; vii. 4; viii. 22, 23; xvii. 11, 14, 16, et pass. 1 John i. 7; ii. 9, 11, 16, 21; iii. 10; iv. 1, 2, 3, 5; v. 11, et pass.

77. *μαρτυρεῖν, μαρτυρία* (not *μαρτύριον*), i. 7, 8, 15, 19, 32, 34; ii. 25; iii. 11, 26, 28, 32, 33; iv. 3, 9, 44; v. 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, et pass. 1 John i. 2; iv. 14; v. 6-11.

Credner remarks, that the apostle uses most of these expressions both in a literal and metaphorical sense, placing the one immediately after the other.

VI. Comparison of the contents with those of the synoptical Gospels.

1. Similarity. 2. Diversity (*a*) in narrating the same things. (*b*) in presenting additional particulars.

1. The following particulars are related both by John and the synoptists.

The cleansing of the temple, ii. 13-22. Compare with Matt. xxi. 12, 13; Mark xi. 15-17; Luke xix. 45, 46.

Perhaps, however, this act was repeated by our Saviour; John relating it as occurring at *one passover;* the other evangelists *at another.*

The miraculous feeding of the multitude, vi. 1-14. Compare with Matt. xiv. 13-21; Mark vi. 30-34; Luke ix. 10-17.

Jesus walks on the sea, vi. 15-21. Compare with Matt. xiv. 22-36; Mark vi. 45-56.

The woman anointing his feet at the supper in Bethany, xii. 2-8. Compare with Matt. xxvi. 6-13; Mark iii. 9.

His public entry into Jerusalem, xii. 12-19. Compare with Matt. xxi. 1-11; Mark xi. 1-11; Luke xix. 29-44.

Jesus points out his betrayer, xiii. 21-26. Compare with Matt. xxvi. 21-25; Mark xiv. 18-21; Luke xxii. 21-23.

He foretells the denial of himself by Peter, xiii. 36-38. Compare with Matt. xxvi. 31-35; Mark xiv. 27-31; Luke xxii. 31-38.

The Passion and Resurrection, xviii. 1—xx. 29. Compare with Matt. xxvi. 36—xxviii.

Besides these particulars, what took place at the baptism of Jesus is inserted in the Baptist's testimony, i. 32-34; while various sentences and proverbial expressions coincide more or less closely with parallels found in the other Gospels; such as iv. 44 with Matt. xiii. 57; Mark i. 4; Luke iv. 24. John xii. 25 with Matt. x. 39; Mark viii. 35; Luke xvii. 33. John xiii. 20 with Matt. x. 40. John xiii. 16 with Matt. x. 24; Luke vi. 40. John xiv. 31 with Matt. xxvi. 46. John xvi. 2 with Matt. xxiv. 9; Mark xiii. 9; Luke xxi. 12.

The agreement of John with the synoptists in relating the same occurrence is seldom verbal, although such verbal coincidence often appears among the synoptists themselves. In general he approximates more nearly to Matthew than Mark or Luke; but there are exceptions to this statement.

2. The diversity between these cognate paragraphs is considerable, affecting not only *the form* but *the substance* of the narrative. Some regard it as amounting to contradiction in several cases. It is *apparently* greatest in regard to the day of the Redeemer's death—in the mode of pointing out the traitor at the Last Supper—in the denial of Peter, and in John's testimony of Jesus. Where the sacred writer treats *in part* of topics copiously or formally described in the synoptists, there is also great diversity. New light is thrown on them by his statements. Thus in relation to the calling of the apostles (i. 35-43, compared with Matt. iv. 18-22), the accounts manifest discrepancy. The same remark applies to the particulars preceding the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem (x. 40, etc.; xi. 17, 54; xii. 1; compared with Matt. xix. 1; xx. 17-19, 29; xxi. 1, etc). In all these examples, no *real* discrepancy has yet been proved. The accounts are *different*, but not *contradictory*.

Diversity in *form* is still greater than in *substance*. In such sections as agree with others in the synoptists, John's relations are more circumstantial, and usually more graphic than Matthew's. But they are inferior to those of Mark, with one or two exceptions. In the history of Christ's passion and resurrection, he excels the other evangelists; none of them exhibiting the same

graphic simplicity. In the discourses, the dialogue-form and alternation of speakers are clearly marked, by which feature the apostle before us is distinguished from the synoptists. Sometimes he annexes a brief explanation to the sayings of his divine Master, while the doctrinal aspect of these utterances and discourses is more prominent. An enigmatical character belongs to them. They are darkly figurative. They present a typical or allegorical appearance.

With regard to the diversity existing between this Gospel and the preceding three, by means of the new matter incorporated, the most remarkable phenomena are the enlargement of the Saviour's ministry both in sphere and time, so that He appears very generally in Judea, and attends three Passovers at least, if not four; while in the synoptists his ministrations belong chiefly to Galilee, whence he goes up to *one* Passover at Jerusalem before He suffered. The most important addition which he makes to the evangelical history consists of the long and deeply interesting discourses of Christ recorded in chapters xiii-xvii., and the resurrection of Lazarus, the description of which is unequalled. Other circumstances, not recorded by the synoptists, are inserted in ii. 1-12; iii. 1-21; iv. 4-42; v. 1-47; vii. 2—xi. 54; xii. 20-50, etc. etc. Thus two-thirds of the Gospel are new. Hence we are indebted to the beloved disciple for very much in the life of our Lord of which we should otherwise have been ignorant.

VII. Integrity of the Gospel.

Several parts of the Gospel have been suspected of being supposititious, such as the twenty-first chapter; the first eleven verses of the eighth preceded by the last verse of the seventh chapter; and a small portion of the fifth chapter. Let us examine these portions.

The Gospel properly terminates with the twentieth chapter; and the twenty-first must be considered an appendix rather than a constituent part of it. The question then arises, Who was the author of the last chapter? Was it John himself, to whom we owe the entire Gospel? or did some later writer affix it? Some deny the authenticity of the entire chapter; while others, more

moderate in their negative criticism, reject no more than the last two verses. We shall first consider these verses.

The plural number *οἴδαμεν* is the first thing which arrests the attention, as contrary to John's usual diction. In speaking of himself, he never uses the first person singular or plural, but always the third. Hence the verb *οἶμαι*, in the twenty-fifth verse, is also foreign to the language of John. Here however Hug replies, by pointing to the expression *ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ* (i. 14), and to the frequent use in his epistles of *γράφω*, *ἔγραψα*, *ἀκηκόαμεν*, *ἑωράκαμεν*. But the verb *ἐθεασάμεθα* does not mean that *John himself* saw, *to the exclusion of* others; it is applied to the apostles and disciples generally, *including himself*. The example is therefore inapposite. The instances given from his epistles of the use of the first singular and plural are of no value, because they are found in epistles where one person writing to another, or to a church, must necessarily appear in his individuality. Had they belonged to the Gospel, they would have annihilated the objection; but being found in the epistles, they leave it untouched. Looking at *οἴδαμεν* and *οἶμαι* together, it would seem, either that there were several witnesses to the truth of the statements made by John, for whom one might speak; or that the plural *οἴδαμεν* is employed instead of the singular. In either case, *the writer* is distinguished from the witness or witnesses testifying to the accuracy of what he wrote. "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true. And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."

Again, the hyperbolical tone of the twenty-fifth verse is unlike the simple modesty of John. It is true that various attempts have been made to lessen its exaggerated tone, by assigning peculiar interpretations to the words *κόσμος* and *χωρεῖν*; but they are too artificial to be adopted, except in an extremity. The obvious sense of the former is *the material world*, and of the latter *to contain*, in regard to *space*. Nor is the relative pronoun *ὅσα* ever used by the apostle as a mere relative, in the manner it is here employed in, so that it assists in corroborating suspicion against the

verse in which it stands. Lachmann indeed, after B. and Origen, reads ἅ, which agrees with John's diction; but authority favours the received ὅσα. Such are the internal considerations unfavourable to the authenticity of these verses. But when we look for external evidence on the same side of the question, it is almost wanting. All MSS. and versions have the portion; and no editor, however sceptical, has ventured to expunge it from the text. Some indeed of the ancient fathers were not insensible to its peculiarities, and evidently suspected its authenticity. We need only refer to Theodore of Mopsuestia, Cyril, Theophylact, and Euthymius as stumbling at it. An old scholion, too, on the twenty-fifth verse, found in several MSS. belonging to the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, is remarkable as shewing that the Greek church was suspicious of it. It runs thus: "Others say, this verse [*i. e.* the twenty-fifth] is an addition: that some one of the *philoponists* having put it in the margin, in order to assert that the miracles wrought by the Lord were more in number than those which are recorded, some other, through ignorance of the intention of the former, brought it within the text, and having made it a part of the Scripture of the Gospel, time and custom brought it to be introduced into all the Gospels."[g]

On the whole, the internal evidence, apart from the external, seems to us sufficiently weighty to justify a denial of the authenticity of the Gospel's conclusion as it stands in our modern copies. It is incredible that John, after concluding his Gospel with the words "and many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His disciples, which are not written in this book," should resume and repeat the same thing in the exaggerated statement, "there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." The hyperbolical amplification points to another person.

According to Lücke and others, these two verses are inseparable from the preceding part of the chapter. The learned commentator argues, that the appendix requires some conclusion, such as the

[g] See the original words in Wetstein's N. T., i. 964, where they are given from cod. 36, a MS. of the eleventh century. The same gloss, nearly *verbatim*, is also given by Birch from various codd. Consult his note to the last verse of John's Gospel.

twenty-fourth verse at least. Whoever wrote the latter, wrote the preceding also. And as there is no reason for separating the twenty-fifth from the twenty-fourth, it follows, that if these two were not written by John, the preceding twenty-three verses could not have proceeded from him. Such is the manner in which Lücke reasons. But its conclusiveness may be questioned. The appendix indeed needs a termination; but that termination is not necessarily the entire twenty-fourth verse. The first half of it is sufficient; and here we believe the writer to have finished his work. "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things and wrote these things," is language characteristic of John; whereas the next words, "and we know that his testimony is true," etc., betray another hand. Hence we divide the twenty-fourth verse, attaching the first part of it to the preceding paragraph, and putting the latter part with the twenty-fifth verse in the rank of an adventitious appendage.

Let us now glance at the reasons advanced for rejecting the authenticity of *the chapter*, which portion is said to betray another writer than the evangelist in ideas, style, and language.

(*a*) The expression ἕως ἔρχομαι in the twenty-second and twenty-third verses, is used in a different acceptation from that which it bears in the Gospel; as may be seen from a comparison with the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth chapters; while the twofold specification of the author in the twentieth verse is contrary to the usual simplicity of John.

(*b*) It is asserted, that even had the apostle himself already written the appendix, he would have removed the conclusion of the Gospel contained in the thirtieth and thirty-first verses of the twentieth chapter, though existing in its present form, and placed it in another form at the end of the twenty-first chapter.

(*c*) It is also stated, that after the termination of the twentieth chapter, no person could ever have expected a third manifestation of Jesus, much less the discourse between Jesus and Peter at the fifteenth and following verses — a discourse essentially different from that before held with Thomas, by its descending to individual relations and circumstances, without sliding into general ideas after John's manner.

(*d*) The language presents so many elements unlike those

which characterise the apostle, that he must have either deteriorated in power of writing, or a worse composer than he have produced the chapter.

(*e*) The narrative is also charged with throwing over the miraculous an air of wild adventurousness; with an endeavour to present things *palpably* by minute specification of numbers, without attaining real vividness—qualities foreign to John's manner.

It is superfluous to dwell on these various particulars urged by Lücke, and magnified into so much importance as to justify a denial of the chapter's authenticity. It appears to us, that subjective taste and tact have led the learned commentator to require of the apostle more than is warranted by other parts of the Gospel. The sacred writer has been subjected to a test much too rigorous and partial. Even were the premises fully made out, the sacred author would be reduced to an exact standard of uniformity, by which he ought not to be tried. There is certainly some reason for minute inquiry—some colour for suspicion in regard to authorship—some strangeness in parts of the narrative;—but the impression it leaves on the mind, considered as a whole, is decidedly in favour of the apostolic authorship. Little points here and there occasionally disturb the general tenor of the description viewed as originating with the writer of the preceding portions; but these are trifling when contrasted with the current of the entire chapter.

(*a*) Our Saviour, in reply to Peter, intended to restrain his idle curiosity by saying: "If I will that he live till my second coming," etc. Here his coming refers to his *second* coming to judgment, not to *the death* of the disciple, as Grotius, Lampe, and Olshausen suppose. Nor is the use of the verb ἔρχομαι in John xiv. 3, 18, 28, inconsistent with this meaning. In the first passage, it *has* the same sense; so that Jesus does not now employ the word for the first time in a method perfectly new or unknown to the disciples. In the second and third passages, the meaning is the same; though possibly, in the former of them, the additional idea of Christ coming again to his disciples by His Spirit is also included. In the present instance, ἔρχομαι is used of the *day of judgment;* so that Jesus' meaning was virtually, "If I will that he should never die," as the disciples understood it.

The double specification of the author in the twentieth verse was probably employed for the purpose of indubitably identifying the writer with the disciple of whom Jesus spoke. If intended to prevent all mistake in regard to the person, it is quite apposite.

Hug conjectures that it was meant to obviate suspicion, because John himself perceived that an appendix, subjoined after the apparent conclusion of his work, might be subject to suspicion. Hence the sacred writer has taken so much precaution to indicate who the writer was.

(*b*) It is hazardous to affirm what John would have done in the relations he sustained. Although Lücke may think it natural that he should have acted in a certain manner; it is precarious to draw any certain conclusion from our subjective ideas. The Gospel was properly finished at the close of the twentieth chapter; and that the writer should have erased the last two verses, when subsequently appending another chapter, is by no means probable. Both he and the other sacred writers were little studious of exact disposition and method. The commencement of the twenty-first chapter appears to be immediately connected with the twenty-ninth verse of the twentieth; the thirtieth and thirty-first being the conclusion to the whole Gospel, placed there when the author did not think of writing any more. When he *did* subsequently resolve on putting an appendix, he did not deem it necessary to disturb the conclusion before written, or to alter its place. Another writer, wishing to annex a chapter that should be considered the production of the apostle John, might readily have displaced the conclusion for the purpose of furthering his design; but the apostle himself did not consider it necessary to do so.

(*c*) It is quite true, that none would have suspected a third manifestation of Jesus; but the unexpected appearance of the appendix forms no sufficient reason for rejecting it; especially if we consider that it was not written at the same time with the twentieth chapter.

The difference of person, circumstances, and object, will fully account for the difference of character in the discourses held with Thomas and Simon Peter. The individual traits, the minute particulars of Jesus' converse with Peter, stamp it with originality.

The very fact of the narrative descending to particulars gives it a graphic fidelity. Had it been limited to general ideas, it would never have produced the same impression on the reader. The sketch betrays the pen of an eye-witness, who has drawn it so characteristically that the hand of an impostor or copyist cannot be detected. "The narrative," says Hug, "is animated by a particularity which we could expect only from an eye-witness, by whom every circumstance was remarked with extreme interest and lodged deep in his memory. He not only recalls every individual concerned, though he wrote many years after the occurrence, but many incidental things which one would far less expect to find stated. He still knows exactly how and with what Peter girt himself in haste to go to our Lord. With the practised eye of a fisherman, he judges the distance of the ship from the land: '*It was not far, but as it were two hundred cubits from land.*' He still knows the number of the fishes which they caught. Nor does he give merely a general statement of the number; not a single one escapes him: '*They were an hundred fifty and three.*' He still wonders, too, how it happened that the net did not break.

"Now, who could know all these minute circumstances after the lapse of years, unless he had been one of those engaged in catching the fishes, and had shared them with the rest? Is not the eye-witness and participator visible every where[h]?"

(*d*) The language is undeniably like that of John. The style and manner strongly remind the reader of the beloved apostle, as even Lücke and Credner allow. They account for it by imitation. But the fact that *a copyist* wrote it is not marked. It does not strike the reader's observation. A critic himself, minutely inspecting the diction, has to grope for the dissimilarity. The deviations, if such they must be considered, from John's manner, are slight. Thus ἔρχεσθαι σύν (xxi. 3), for which the apostle employs ἀκολουθεῖν, must be attributed to the love of variety. So also νῦν put *after* the verb (10th verse), which is found elsewhere *before* the imperative; ἐπενδύτης instead of ἱμάτιον or χιτών; τολμᾶν and ἐξετάζειν; φέρειν instead of ἄγειν; πρωΐας γενομένης instead of πρωΐ; ἐπιστραφείς for στραφείς εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω,

[h] Fosdick's translation, p. 486.

must be assigned in part to the same cause, and partly to the new things mentioned. The general similarity is so great, that the narrative is commonly traced to John *indirectly*, some of his disciples who heard him frequently repeat it having written it soon after the apostle's death, before the Gospel had properly got into circulation, or had been frequently transcribed.

The variations of language are really too trifling to build much upon; especially in connection with the fact that John's stock of words does not seem to have been so very limited as to bind him to the use of the very same phraseology on all occasions. The deterioration in power of writing is not apparent, and may be sufficiently explained from the paragraph appearing *subsequently* to the Gospel.

De Wette ingenuously confesses, that the arguments drawn from the diction are not decisive against the authenticity, except the use of ἔρχομαι. Here, however, the commentator is mistaken; for the verb refers to the second coming of Christ, and is so employed, as we have seen, in a former passage by the evangelist.

(*e*) This consideration is chiefly drawn from the subjective feelings of the commentator. There is indeed more minuteness in the representation given than we find in the proper Gospel; but this feature was appropriate to the chapter which was to demonstrate the reality of Jesus' resurrection — *the identity* of the resurrection-body with that which had suffered on the cross; and to do away with the current misapprehension of the disciples regarding Jesus' words to John.

The real difficulties of the chapter, except in the last two verses of it, are few, and far too light to overthrow the weight of those standing on the other side of the question. It was written by John *after* the Gospel; and any attempt to assign it either to John the Presbyter, as Wieseler[1] imagines; or to the Ephesian Church, as Grotius does, is utterly fruitless.

Regarding the silence of Irenaeus about the twenty-first chapter, which Lücke has brought forward against its authenticity, much need not be said; since we do not possess all that father's writings. If they were all extant, and no reference made to the portion in any of them, the suspicion against it would indeed be strong.

[1] Dissertatio inauguralis, pp. 42, 43.

Another portion of the fourth Gospel, whose authenticity has been questioned, is chapter vii. 53-viii. 11. The paragraph has given rise to strong suspicion. Many have denied that it was written by the author of the Gospel, or by John the Apostle. It is found, however, in many ancient authorities, and is defended by numerous critics.

i. It is contained in upwards of 200 MSS., among which are the uncial D. G. H. K. M. U. Jerome too says that it was found in many Greek and Latin MSS., while some scholiasts appeal to its existence in ancient copies (*ἀρχαῖα ἀντίγραφα*).

Of versions, it is in the Arabic, Persian, Coptic, Æthiopic, in MSS. of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Syriac of Jerusalem, Slavonic, Anglo-Saxon, in most MSS. of the old Italic, the Vulgate, the Apostolic Constitutions.

It is also quoted by Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Sedulius, Leo, Chrysologus, Cassiodorus, the author of the Synopsis Sacrae Scripturae, and by Euthymius as an addition to the Gospel not without use.

ii. On the other hand, it is wanting in B, C, L, T, X, Δ, in about 50 written in the cursive character, and 30 evangelistaria. Probably too A. wanted it, for the two leaves of the codex here deficient in that MS. would not have been sufficient to contain the twelve verses with the other portion. It should also be remarked, that C is defective from vi. 50 to viii. 12. In L, the empty space left is not large enough to contain the whole piece. In Δ there is also a gap. The verses are marked with an obelus in S, and in about 30 MSS. They are asterisked in E and 14 MSS. Eight codices and one evangelistarium put them at the end of the Gospel. Others place a part of them there; viz., from viii. 3-11. Others have them at the end of the twenty-first chapter of Luke; and others at the end of John vii. 36. The scholion of cod. i. observes, that the portion is wanting in most ancient codices (*πλεῖστα ἀντίγραφα*); while Euthymius says, that it is not found in the *most accurate*, or is marked with obeli.

It is not in the oldest MSS. and editions of the Peshito; for it is certain that it was first rendered into Syrian in the sixth century.

The MSS. of the Philoxenian that have it, exhibit it partly in the margin; if in the text, very often with the remark that it is not found in all copies. Most MSS. of the Coptic have it not. In the Sahidic, in codices of the Armenian, in the Gothic, etc., it is not found.

Nor is it mentioned by Origen, Apollinaris, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria, Crysostom, Basil, Tertullian, Cyprian, Juvencus, Cosmas, Nonnus, Theophylact, etc.

From this summary it will be seen, that D is the oldest codex possessing the paragraph, though certainly in a peculiar form unlike that of the received text. But the MS. is not free from apocryphal additions, especially in Matthew xx. 28, and Luke vi. 5. The fact of the paragraph's absence from B and probably A, far outweighs its appearance in D. It is very remarkable too, that so many MSS. having it, affix marks of rejection or interpolation; while the various positions it has been forced to occupy, confirm the suspicions entertained against it.

The fact, moreover, of its being wanting in the old Syriac, is strong testimony against its authenticity.

It must be allowed, that Origen's silence regarding it is unimportant, because he had no occasion to mention it when commenting on viii. 22. But the silence of Cyprian and Tertullian is weighty, because both wrote on subjects in which the account would have been peculiarly appropriate. With regard to the latter, Granville Penn thus forcibly reasons: "That the passage was wholly unknown to Tertullian, at the end of the second century, is manifest in his book, '*De Pudicitia.*'" The bishop of Rome had issued an edict, granting pardon to the crime of *adultery*, on repentance. This new assumption of power fired the indignation of Tertullian, who thus apostrophised him: "Audio edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium, '*Pontifex* scilicet *Maximus*, episcopus episcoporum dicit: Ego et *moechiae* et *fornicationis delicta, poenitentia functis, dimitto*" (c. i.). He then breaks out in terms of the highest reprobation against that invasion of the divine prerogative; and (c. 6) thus challenges: "Si ostendas de quibus patrociniis *exemplorum* praeceptorumque *coelestium*, *soli moechiae*, et in ea fornicationi quoque, januam poenitentiae expandas, ad *hanc jam lineam* dimicabit nostra congressio."—"If thou canst

shew me by what authority of *heavenly examples* or precepts thou openest a door for penitence to *adultery alone*, and therein to fornication, our controversy shall be disputed on *that ground*." And he concludes with asserting, "Quaecunque auctoritas, quaecunque ratio *moecho et fornicatori* pacem ecclesiasticam reddit, eadem debebit et homicidae et idolatriae poenitentibus subvenire." —"Whatever authority, whatever consideration restores the peace of the church to the *adulterer* and *fornicator*, ought to come to the relief of those who repent of *murder* or *idolatry*." It is manifest, therefore, that the copies of St. John with which Tertullian was acquainted, did not contain the "*exemplum coeleste*"—the "*divine example*," devised in the story of the "*woman taken in adultery*."[k]

Much of the suspicion which naturally lies against the passage, would be removed if Augustine's method of accounting for its omission could be rendered probable: "Nonnulli modicae, vel potius inimici verae fidei, credo, metuentes peccandi impunitatem dari mulieribus suis, illud, quod de adulterae indulgentia dominus fecit, *auferrent* de codicibus suis, quasi permissionem peccandi tribuerit, qui dixit: deinceps noli peccare."[l] Nicon states a similar reason which the Armenians may have had for excluding the passage[m]. So also Ambrose remarks: "Profecto si quis ea auribus otiosis accipiat, erroris incentivum incurrit."[n] It is observable, however, that Augustine does not say the paragraph was really ejected from Greek MSS. for the reason he assigns. He merely conjectures, that some persons of weak faith, or rather enemies of the true faith, *might have* expunged it from their copies through fear of giving encouragement to sin. The father speaks of *the feeling* regarding the passage in the minds of some contemporaries; but that he describes *the original cause* of its rejection, or that he had the means of knowing it, cannot be maintained. It is quite impossible, also, that this reason could have operated uniformly, both among the Greeks and Latins. Critical reasons may have led to its rejection, as well as doctrinal ones. It cannot be shewn, that the latter induced its expulsion from a single copy.

[k] Annotations to the Book of the New Covenant, pp. 267, 268.
[l] De adulterinis conjugiis, ii. 7.
[m] See Cotelerii Patres apostolici, vol. i. p. 238, ed altera Clerici.
[n] Apologia Davidis posterior, c. 1.

The only circumstance favourable to Augustine's conjecture is the fact that several copies omit no more than verses 3-11, beginning to reject where the matter seemed questionable.. In regard to Chrysostom, Matthaei has laboured to account for his silence on the supposition of his acquaintance with the paragraph; but his arguments are overthrown by Lücke. Whatever may be said in favour of the pious orator thinking it unadvisable to expound the story before a voluptuous people, he was not so timid as Matthaei represents him. The paragraph must have been read before the people, both before and after Chrysostom's time. It is found in many evangelistaria; and we know that it was publicly read on certain festivals. On the whole, it cannot be shewn that the Greek church had it in their MSS. before the *fifth* century; or that the Latin church had it before the *fourth*. It came from the West into the East not earlier than the fifth century.

There are three readings of it which differ considerably from one another. Surely this circumstance is unfavourable to the genuineness of it; for no authentic passage in John presents an approximation to so many variations and different readings. Griesbach gives the three texts, of which that in D is the oldest.

On reviewing the external evidence for and against the paragraph, we believe that the latter predominates; and so furnishes a reason for entertaining suspicions of its spurious character. If the authorities be not *decisive* of the question, they are of *considerable weight*, at least in conducting to a determination *adverse* to the passage. Lachmann expunges it from the text.

In discussing the internal evidence, we shall first adduce that which may be urged against the authenticity.

1. The diction and manner of the paragraph present few of the characteristics of John. They are strikingly foreign to him. Thus we find ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν οἶκον instead of ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἴδια. The frequent use of δέ, whereas John has commonly οὖν: ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸ ὄρος instead of ἀνῆλθεν or ἀνεχώρησεν: ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν seems derived from the synoptists: ὄρθρου instead of πρωΐ or πρωΐας γενομένης: παρεγένετο instead of ἀνέβη or ἔρχεσθαι εἰς: πᾶς ὁ λαός instead of ὄχλος: οἱ γραμματεῖς, κ. τ. λ. is not used by John: καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς is unlike the apostle's diction: κατειλημένην is used in a sense in which

the verb is never employed by the apostle: *ἐν μέσῳ* instead of *εἰς τὸ μέσον: ἐνετείλατο* instead of *γέγραπται, ἔγραψεν, γεγραμμένον ἐστί.* The pronoun *ἡμῖν* should be put *after* the verb according to John's manner, not *before* it: *λιθοβολεῖσθαι* instead of *λιθάζειν*, which last Scholz has taken into the text, though too slenderly supported: *ἔγραφεν* the imperfect, is unlike the apostle: *ἐπέμενον ἐρωτῶντες, ἀναμάρτητος, συνείδησις*, are all *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα: ἐσχάτων* is an unsuitable antithesis to *πρεσβυτέρων: κατελείφθη* instead of the verb *ἀφίεσθαι: ἐν μέσῳ ἑστῶσα* instead of *μέση ἑστῶσα: πλήν* instead of *εἰ μή: κατέκρινεν* instead of *ἔκρινεν.* There are also *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* which we have not adduced, because they may be accounted for by the subject of the paragraph. So many phrases, unlike those of the apostle, are crowded into the verses, that it would be most strange if they proceeded from him. Indeed the numerous variations shew, that the diction early proved a stumbling-block to transcribers. Hence they endeavoured to correct it, by bringing it nearer the apostle's acknowledged style.

2. Great difficulties belong to the interpretation of the passage, which some, as Strauss, pronounce insuperable; others, as Olshausen, Lücke, and De Wette, confess themselves unable to resolve in a satisfactory method. But Ebrard, Hitzig, and Tholuck do not find them so intractable. The chief perplexity lies in the fifth and following verses. We shall briefly indicate the points that excite suspicion from their peculiar obscurity.

(*a*) The Scribes and Pharisees must either have acted by authority of the Sanhedrim, or in their private capacity. If the former, they would not afterwards have allowed the woman to escape, but have taken her before those in whose name she had been apprehended. If the latter, how could they say, "Moses commanded *us*," etc., as if they were official judges entrusted with the execution of the law?

To this Tholuck replies, that the Scribes, including members of the Sanhedrim, acted in their private capacity; their design being to bring the woman before the court of justice assembled in the hall of the temple. But in passing Jesus, the thought arose in their minds of embarrassing the hated friend of sinners with the case. Hence they asked a decision of him. This reply is

consistent with the supposition of the persons who brought the woman, or at least some of them, being deputed by the Sanhedrim; but not that they were sent *officially*. The narrative furnishes room for *conjecture* in regard to the character sustained by the Scribes and Pharisees, in which light the solution of Tholuck may be regarded; but some uncertainty must ever attach to the point. Whether they were witnesses and accusers, or judges, is obscure, the account itself in different parts sanctioning both suppositions, and leaving the whole matter unexplained. Many have supposed the Scribes to belong to the class of *Zelotae;* but as such they would have punished the guilty parties on the spot, at the very time the crime was committed.

(*b*) In the Pentateuch, the punishment of death generally is enjoined for adultery (Levit. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22), and the mode is specified in the Talmud as *strangulation.* But stoning is here pronounced to be the punishment. Hence another difficulty arises. Michaelis° removes it, by rejecting the authority of the Mishna in this instance. It must be admitted that the Rabbinical interpretations of the law are sometimes erroneous. It is freely granted that such testimony is insufficient to prove the existence of a custom before the destruction of Jerusalem *in every case.* Yet it seems arbitrary to discard the voice of the Rabbins as worthless on the present point. To shew the rule of the Talmud incorrect, Michaelis adduces Exodus xxi. 14, and xxxv. 2, where it is said of the profaner of the Sabbath, "he shall die the death"; and yet from Numbers xv. 32 we learn, that the man who violated the sacred day was to be put to death by stoning. But in this case there is an authentic exposition of the law in the Pentateuch itself; whereas there is no such explanation of the particular kind of death here meant, so that reasoning from the one to the other is inconclusive.

The learned professor also affirms, that strangling is not a punishment of the Mosaic law, but a Rabbinical fiction fastened on it. It is true that strangling is not mentioned in the Pentateuch; yet the general expression, *die the death*, in the case of the adulterer and adulteress, may have been properly explained by

° Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, translated by Smith, vol. iv. p. 141 et seqq.

the Rabbins. The question is, Are they the best interpreters of the law in the present instance? If they are not, where shall we find a more probable explanation of it? The punishment is not specified in the Pentateuch itself, so that we are almost shut up to the Rabbinical exposition, where there is no good reason for departing from it.

Nor is the hypothesis of Grotius probable, viz. that from the time of Ezekiel, the severe punishment of stoning had been substituted for adultery, a crime that had become common. The foundation for this conjecture is Kimchi's explanation of a passage in Ezekiel xvi. 38, 40, and the apocryphal history of Susanna as interpreted by Jerome. Both however are too uncertain to be relied on.

Selden, Lightfoot, and Meyer have resorted to another solution of the difficulty, viz. by assuming the woman to have been a *betrothed virgin;* in which case, if the crime were committed in the city, both parties were to be brought to the gate, according to the law, and there to be stoned (Deut. xxii. 22, 23, 24). The authority of Philo[p] is quoted for calling this sin μοιχεία, or rather εἶδος μοιχείας. But the explanation in question is too artificial; not to mention the fact, that according to it we should have expected a specification of *the locality* where the deed had been committed, in the field or in the city, because the punishment varied according to the place. Besides, to call this particular crime μοιχεία, seems to belong merely to the peculiarities of Philo, as Paulus has appropriately remarked.

The solution given by Ebrard, which is adopted and pronounced satisfactory by Tholuck, is the best that has been offered. Whether it furnish a complete reconciliation of the narrative before us with the Mosaic law, may however be still questioned. According to him, the passage in Deut. xxii. 20-25 mentions four cases of fornication. For the first and third (verses 20, 23), the punishment of *stoning* is named, while for the second and fourth, *death* generally is assigned. But the contrast between "the man only shall die," in the twenty-fifth verse, and "ye shall stone them with stones," in the twenty-fourth, shews that the punishment of stoning is also implied in the second and fourth cases.

[p] De legg. special. ed. Richter, sect. 12.

The four examples given in the passage can scarcely be reckoned together as examples of *fornication*. They are rather distinct and separate crimes, each demanding its own punishment. Besides, the present case does not fall appropriately under the second or the fourth, to neither of which is μοιχεία rightly applied. Thus the explanation seems to us insufficient.

(*c*) The greatest perplexity connected with the paragraph lies in the reason for bringing the case before Jesus. No adequate motive appears to induce the Scribes and Pharisees to employ this woman for the purpose of embarrassing the Redeemer, and thence extracting a ground of accusation against Him. It is evident that they wished to entrap Him: the narrative itself states that they *tempted* him in order to procure a tangible charge; but *how* they expected to do so by means of the adulteress is exceedingly obscure. Various solutions of the difficulty have been supplied.

Michaelis thinks[q], that the crime had become so common among the Jews at that time as to cause an abandonment of the legal punishment, for the purpose of sparing thousands of criminals. This however is a mere conjecture. And even if it were true, it would not remove the difficulty, because Jesus might have appealed to the ordinary judicial usage in such cases, to which his enemies could not have objected without condemning themselves.

Grotius, on the other hand, endeavours to solve the mystery by a reference to the civil condition of the Jews. If Christ decided in favour of stoning the adulteress, he would have furnished a ground for accusing him before the Roman authorities; because in that case he would apparently have allowed the Jews the right of executing the punishment of which they had been deprived by the Romans. If he pronounced judgment in favour of the accused, and contrary to the strict letter of the law, he would have incurred the hatred of those who were friends to national liberty. This is unsatisfactory, because Jesus might have judged the case *agreeably* to the Mosaic law, without empowering the Jews to carry the sentence into execution. Pronouncing his decision according to the letter of the law is not

[q] Anmerkungen zum Johannes, p. 111.

at all connected with assigning the execution of it to the Jews alone.

Schulthess[r] has given a different version of the matter. He supposes that all capital cases at that time were determined according to the criminal laws of the Romans, which had been introduced into Judea; and that therefore adultery could not have been punished with death by the Jews, they being subject to the Romans who did not visit the sin with too severe an infliction. The Jews however were strongly inclined to rebel against the principles of Roman legislation by which they were bound, especially as the sect of the zealots was still in existence, though their leader was dead. If therefore the Pharisees had procured from Jesus, who insisted so much on the indissolubleness of the marriage-tie, a judgment condemnatory of the offender, he might have easily rekindled the smouldering, tumultuary spirit of the zealots, and have thus been accused before Pilate of being a second Judas of Galilee.

This solution bears the aspect of artificial elaborateness, furnishing a presumption against it. But indeed it is quite improbable, that the Romans should have proceeded according to the exact letter of their laws, in the provinces. Some accommodation to the usages and customs of the people whom they had conquered, commonly took place. And if a tumultuary uproar on the part of the zelotae had arisen from the decision of Jesus, it would have been scarcely deemed a political crime, or have been regarded by the Romans as requiring summary punishment on any, except the persons themselves concerned in it. On various occasions, we read that the Jews took up stones to stone Christ; and it would be impossible to prove that they belonged to the sect of the zealots.

Stäudlin[s] and Hug[t] give a peculiar turn to the opinion of Grotius, explaining the difficulty by means of the fact, that the punishment of stoning was expressly disallowed by the Romans. But even granting the truth of the fact (which it would be difficult to prove), Jesus might easily have satisfied the requirement

[r] In Winer's and Engelhardt's neues kritisches Journal, vol. v. 3. p. 200, et seqq.

[s] Prolusio qua Pericopae de adultera Joh. vii. 53 - viii. 11, veritas et authentia defenditur. 4to. 1806.

[t] De conjugii Christiani vinculo indissolubili. 8vo. 1816.

of the Mosaic law and prevented all ground of accusation by pronouncing the sentence of death generally, without specifying the mode of that death, particularly as it is left indefinite in the law itself.

Dieck[u] the jurist has furnished another solution. According to the principles laid down by Jesus in the sermon on the mount, he could not have approved of death in the present case. Hence, if he decided according to the law of Moses, the Pharisees would have represented him as inconsistent with himself; but if against the law, they would have held him up to scorn as a despiser of Moses. Without entering into an examination of Dieck's assertion that from Matthew v. 31, 32 the conclusion irresistibly follows that the punishment of death is too severe for adultery, it is easy to see that too much acuteness is ascribed to the Pharisees on the one hand, and too little decision to the character of Jesus on the other. The latter never hesitated to avow the legitimate consequences of his principles.

Augustine[x] long ago sought an explanation in the conflict between Jesus' acknowledged mildness on the one hand, and his love of justice on the other. If the Redeemer decided in favour of strict law, it would have been said that he was not so good or benevolent as he appeared; if the contrary, he would have been termed a transgressor of the law of Moses. But by this interpretation, there was no entanglement in the case, except on the one supposition, that Jesus pronounced an opinion contrary to the letter of the law. On any other assumption, there would have been no ground for accusation.

Euthymius, nearly coinciding with Augustine, thinks that the Jews may have reckoned with confidence on the accustomed excessive lenity of the Saviour towards great sinners, believing that he would protect the accused from the rigour of the law, and thus furnish cause for the accusation of despising and setting it at nought. It is not clear however how they could have been so confident of Jesus' decision, except they had been absolutely blind to his character; for he never abated the strictness of the moral law, though he was the friend of publicans and sinners. He

[u] Studien und Kritiken for 1832. Heft 4.

[x] Tractatus in Johannis Evangelium 53, vol. iii. (ed. Benedict.), p. 531.

came not to destroy but to fulfil the law; so that, although proclaiming forgiveness to the guilty, the demands of justice were not relaxed.

Michaelis conjectures that the Jews calculated on Jesus surely pronouncing in favour of the woman against the strictness of the law, because he had formerly broken the sabbath and spoken of circumcision in a manner liable to be construed into a depreciation of the Mosaic law. But the mode in which he justified an act of healing on the sabbath, deriving the proof of its warrant from that very law, shews that he *respected* the Mosaic institute.

On the whole, none of the solutions offered by numerous inquirers is entirely satisfactory, whatever plausibility may attach to some of them. If the Pharisees had made any *definite calculation* in their own minds of the probable consequences of the case, it is very likely that they reckoned on his acting tenderly towards the woman, contrary to the severity of the law; but the passage in Luke vii. 49, is too narrow a basis to justify the existence of that conviction on their part. It is true that Jesus associated with publicans and sinners, being reproachfully termed their *friend;* but he had never done any thing which could fairly lead his enemies to conclude that he would *transgress the law*, or *sanction iniquity* by undue compassion for the guilty.

The difficulty may be obviated in part by supposing the Scribes and Pharisees so infatuated or filled with malice against Jesus, as to have formed no distinct conception of the mode in which they could reasonably entangle him—that they were so blinded by their evil passions as not to see the improbable in their proceeding. But this is no more than a conjecture. Let the narrative be explained as it may, there is great difficulty in discovering the precise point in which the temptation consisted.

The connection of the paragraph also serves to strengthen suspicion against its apostolic origin. It is introduced abruptly, without discernible reference to the preceding context, and is separated from the subsequent context, to which it forms no natural introduction. The first verse is peculiarly awkward: "Every one went unto his own house;" which must either mean that every one of the Sanhedrists had gone to his house; or, that every one of the people had retired to his abode for the night.

The former sense is certainly improbable; while the latter, which seems to be favoured by the first and second verses of the eighth chapter, is remarkable, because the feast was now passed. Hence the early returning of Jesus and of the people to the temple cannot be readily accounted for. Schulthess, perceiving the inexpediency of referring ἕκαστος to ὄχλος, inasmuch as the latter is not mentioned in the preceding context, explains the words of the separation of the Sanhedrists, which, because it would be trifling to say: "They went to their homes after the sitting of the court was over," he paraphrases so as to educe the sense: "They went to their homes, leaving the matter about which they had been debating unfinished, without arriving at a decision on it." Jesus, conscious of impending danger, spends the night on the mount of Olives. But in the morning he reappears in the temple where all the people were assembled. Thither the Scribes and Pharisees bring the woman, and place her in the midst, asking the ensnaring question. They had found by yesterday's experience, that the multitude were well affected towards him, or at least, that it was difficult to take him from among them; and therefore they resolved, by cunning, either to turn them at once against him, or to tempt him to commit himself in some way which might be used as a valid ground of accusation before the Roman governor. Having pronounced a mild sentence on the woman, he goes on to say: "I am the light of the world—I have come for the purpose of warming and quickening those who are in darkness and perplexity, so that whoever follows me, though he may have been a great sinner, shall no longer wander in the darkness of night, but be encompassed with the light of day. Those therefore entertain evil designs against me, who tempt me to pronounce condemnation on sinners; since I have come to be *the light* of the world, that whosoever believes in me might not walk in darkness, but have the light of life." The beams of the morning sun shining on mount Moriah are supposed to have furnished Jesus with the figure employed.

This paraphrastical explanation of the sequence is laboured and improbable. Besides, the *political* aspect of the temptation is foreign to its nature. The narrative itself gives no hint of the machinations of the Sanhedrim having altered their character, as

they must have done, according to Schulthess, had the political element now entered into them. The thirteenth verse also presents an improbability, on the supposition that the transaction respecting the adulteress immediately preceded. Their consciences had been so smitten, that they went away ashamed and confounded; and yet immediately after, they present themselves before Jesus, and boldly confront him. Nor is the connection between the mildness of the Saviour and the figure of light, either obvious or appropriate.

Bruno Bauer[y] has also endeavoured to point out the union of the paragraph with the preceding and following contexts, but still more unsuccessfully than Schulthess. His Hegelianism has not helped him to a satisfactory explanation.

The story interrupts the connection between the twelfth verse of the eighth chapter, and the fifty-second of the seventh, and was probably inserted in its present place on account of the fifteenth verse, of which it was considered a good illustration. It is true that the connection between the twelfth verse of the eighth chapter and the fifty-second of the seventh is not close, and the former may even relate to a different day from the latter; but yet it must be confessed, that the occurrence interrupts the series of Jesus' discourses with the Scribes and Pharisees. It comes in to disjoin them still more.

Thus internal evidence strengthens suspicion against the apostolic composition of the piece. Its language and style, the difficulties inherent in the fifth and following verses, the disjointed character of the preceding and succeeding contexts, combine with external authorities in disproving its authenticity.

It is needless to inquire who was the writer of it. Hitzig[z] ascribes it to Mark; but the grounds for doing so are precarious. Schulz's opinion that it was written by Luke is equally improbable. Its simplicity and intrinsic character of truthfulness shew that it was not fabricated so late as the third or fourth century. On the contrary they stamp it with credibility, pointing to early evangelical tradition as its source. The truth of the account cannot be reasonably questioned. It was probably derived from the

[y] Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker, p. 302, et seqq.
[z] Ueber Johannes Marcus und seine Schriften, p. 218, et seqq.

current tradition. Every thing connected with it corresponds to the circumstances in which Jesus was placed. It may therefore be regarded as a piece of true history in his life. Although there are difficulties in it *as it now exists*, yet they do not constitute a reason strong enough for assigning it to the region of myth or fiction; else other passages in the Gospel, of unquestioned authenticity, might be similarly discarded. Some have thought the source of it to be *the Gospel of the Hebrews*, because Eusebius speaks of a story in that document respecting a woman accused before Jesus of *many sins;* but the identity of the accounts is not apparent. The woman is there said to have been accused of *many sins* before the Lord, not of *the sin* of adultery. Strauss thinks that it is another form of the story respecting the sinner in the house of Simon the Pharisee contained in the seventh chapter of Luke's Gospel: but the term *accused* (διαβληθεῖσα), applied to the woman, does not suit the female there introduced; and it is also evident, that Eusebius did not find the story given in the Gospel of the Hebrews either in John or Luke. It is not improbable that the story of the woman accused of many sins in the Gospel of the Hebrews, was originally identical with that now introduced into John's Gospel. The woman whom the Pharisees caught in the act of adultery may have previously committed other sins of a like nature. But Eusebius's notice is too short to justify any certain conclusion on the point.

John v. 3, 4.—This passage from ἐκδεχομένων—νοσήματι, has been strongly suspected of spuriousness. It is wanting in B., C., a few codices in the cursive character, some Coptic MSS., the Sahidic version, and Nonnus. In various MSS. too, it is marked with an asterisk or with an obelus.

The last clause of the third verse only, ἐκδεχομένων—κίνησιν, is wanting in A. L. 18.

On the other hand, the fourth verse alone, ἄγγελος—νοσήματι, is wanting in D. 33, the Armenian version, and several MSS. of the Old Italic. In some it is asterisked, in others marked with an obelus.

But the old Syriac and Vulgate have all the words; as also Tertullian, and the later fathers Ambrose, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theophylact, Euthymius, etc.

The numerous variations in the MSS. which have the passage is very remarkable, serving to strengthen suspicion against it. Tischendorf has even expunged it from the text, but Lachmann retains it.

With respect to internal evidence, angelic interference cannot be allowed to influence the decision, although it has been so applied. Tholuck thinks there was no ground for omitting it; whereas De Wette directs attention to the fact, that, as none except Alexandrian authorities want the passage, the omissions may be possibly explained by a remark of Tertullian (De Bapt. c. 5), that the pool had no healing power afterwards. But it cannot be shewn that the Alexandrian critics were the first who omitted it. In the time of Cyril it stood in the text. Besides, there was nothing in the fact of the healing power having ceased, to cause them to stumble; because Jerusalem had been destroyed by the Romans. And then *the miraculous* would have operated in favour of their retaining the place. If the passage be an interpolation, it is not improbable that it proceeded from a Palestinian who entertained the current opinion of the intimate connection between angels and the resources of nature. When once inserted, Tertullian, Chrysostom, and the other fathers would maintain it on doctrinal grounds, as finding in the waters of the pool a symbol of the baptismal water.

There are a great number of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in proportion to the extent of the passage, such as κίνησις, ταραχή, δήποτε, νόσημα, which are very suspicious.

Those who defend the authenticity, adduce the improbability of the evangelist concluding the third verse with ξηρῶν and then continuing with ἦν—ἐκεῖ, maintaining that it was consonant to his purpose to add something, after giving a minute description of the locality in the second and third verses; and that the seventh verse necessarily presupposes or requires the fourth. We must freely confess that we are unable to discover what awkwardness or improbability there is in ἦν—ἐκεῖ, κ. τ. λ. immediately following ξηρῶν. The sequence appears both natural and easy. Nor is there any necessary connection between the minute description of locality in the second verse, and an addition, such as that of the suspected portion. But the argument derived from the

seventh verse has some plausibility. Does it not require, it is asked, the explanation of the fourth? We think not of necessity. If the fourth be taken away, the seventh is sufficiently intelligible. It is true, that *the cause* of the water's agitation will then be unnoticed, and the fact of the first person who steps into the water being alone healed; yet *the healing virtue* of the waters when agitated at certain seasons will be sufficiently indicated. The fourth verse appears much more like an explanation of the seventh, inserted for the very purpose of accounting for the unusual moving of the element and its wonderful virtues, as Paulus[a] seems to suppose.

On the whole, there is ground for strong suspicion against the words before us. They are absent from very old MSS., even from B. itself, although they are also in very old authorities. We will not say so decidedly as some, that they are suppositious; neither will we admit them as authentic. They wear a doubtful aspect. The majority of critics and commentators expunge them, such as Wegscheider, Paulus, Lücke, Marsh, Tholuck, Olshausen, etc.; but Bretschneider and Bruno Bauer defend their authenticity. De Wette and Baumgarten-Crusius are also inclined to keep them in the text.

Schweizer[b] in his recent work has proceeded in a new mode to impugn the integrity of the Gospel. He thinks that the apostle John wished to complete the Galilean tradition by a selection of the more important matter belonging to the extra-Galilean ministry of Jesus. The original apostolic document was arranged according to the festivals attended by Jesus; and therefore the writer had necessarily to touch on His journeys to Galilee, without however giving any narrative of events in connection with the Galilean periods. This appeared strange to a later writer, who inserted some Galilean sections to make the book more complete, by bringing it into harmony with the Galilean evangelical tradition. These sections were not inserted *absolutely*, as the interpolator found them. He made such modifications as were necessary to fit them in their proper places, adapting to them at the same time the surrounding parts of John's work. In this manner,

[a] Commentar über das N. T. Vierten Theiles erste Abtheilung, p. 283.
[b] Das Evangelium Johannis nach seinem innern Werthe untersucht, 1841.

large narratives are attributed to the late writer, such as the account of the marriage in Cana (ii. 1-12), the healing of the nobleman's son (iv. 44-54), the miracle of feeding the multitude, and the crossing over the sea connected with it (vi. 1-26). Smaller insertions are xix. 35-37; xviii. 9; xvi. 30; ii. 21, 22.

We have no hesitation in pronouncing the attempt to separate the spiritual substance of the Gospel from a Galilean interpolation of a different character, utterly impossible. The considerations adduced to support it are slight, arising from *fancied* difficulties, or errors in Schweizer's own perception. While much ingenuity is expended on it, it must be characterised as a worthless and perverse ingenuity. It is marvellous to find how small things are converted into evidence deemed sufficient to set aside the weightiest matters. We stop not to disprove what is not worth the trouble. Those who wish to see the hypothesis refuted, may consult an article by Grimm, in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopaedie, where its untenableness is fully shewn. We are contented to leave it to be numbered among by-gone exhibitions of capricious arbitrariness on the part of learned men.

It is superfluous to refer to the expressions and clauses supposed to be interpolations by Dieffenbach and Schulthess, who, with subjective caprice, have thrown out doubts of various small portions. No attention has been paid to them by succeeding authors.

CORRESPONDENCES OF THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS.

We now proceed to the discussion of a problem which has engaged the attention of many scholars, especially in Germany, and given rise to more treatises in connection with the Gospels than any other. We allude to the mutual coincidences of the first three Gospels, which cannot fail to strike the most superficial reader; and of which it is impossible to have a just conception without the actual inspection of a Greek harmony. Not only is the general outline of those Gospels remarkably similar, but the very words and phrases are frequently alike. Even rare and singular expressions are identical, shewing that the agreement could not be accidental. But in the midst of this minute verbal coincidence, there is so much difference, not only in the materials selected and the general treatment to which they are subjected, but in the expressions and mode of transition from topic to topic, that each writer preserves his own individuality.

Before commencing to discuss the causes of the coincidences in the Gospels, it will be desirable to exhibit the passages in which those coincidences appear. The harmony of the three compositions in matter and manner may be seen in the following sections and passages:—

1.	Matth.—	iii. 1-12.	Mark.—	i. 2-8.	Luke.—	iii. 1-18.
2.	,,	iii. 13-17.	,,	i. 9-11.	,,	iii. 21, 22.
3.	,,	iv. 1-11.	,,	i. 12, 13.	,,	iv. 1-13.
4.	,,	iv. 12-17.	,,	i. 14, 15.	,,	iv. 14, 15.
5.	,,	iv. 18-22.	,,	i. 16-20.	,,	v. 1-11. [33
6.	,,	v. 15.	,,	iv. 21.	,,	viii. 16, & xi.
7.	,,	viii. 2-4.	,,	i. 40-45.	,,	v. 12-16.
8.	,,	viii. 14-17.	,,	i. 29-34.	,,	iv. 38-41.
9.	,,	viii. 23-27.	,,	iv. 36-41.	,,	viii. 22-25.
10.	,,	viii. 28-34.	,,	v. 1-20.	,,	viii. 26-39.

11.	Matth.—	ix. 1-8.	Mark.—	ii. 1-12.	Luke.—	v. 17-26.
12.	,,	ix. 9.	,,	ii. 13, 14.	,,	v. 27, 28.
13.	,,	ix. 10-17.	,,	ii. 15-22.	,,	v. 29-39.
14.	,,	ix. 18-26.	,,	v. 22-43.	,,	viii. 41-56.
15.	,,	x. 1.	,,	vi. 7.	,,	ix. 1.
16.	,,	x. 2-4.	,,	iii. 16-19.	,,	vi. 13-16.
17.	,,	x. 5-14.	,,	vi. 8-11.	,,	ix. 2-5.
18.	,,	xii. 1-8.	,,	ii. 23-28.	,,	vi. 1-5.
19.	,,	xii. 9-14.	,,	iii. 1-6.	,,	vi. 6-11.
20.	,,	xii. 22-30.	,,	iii. 22-27.	,,	xi. 14-23.
21.	,,	xii. 46-50.	,,	iii. 31-35.	,,	viii. 19-21.
22.	,,	xiii. 1-23.	,,	iv. 1-25.	,,	viii. 4-15.
23.	,,	xiv. 1, 2.	,,	vi. 14, 15.	,,	ix. 7, 8.
24.	,,	xiv. 3, 4.	,,	vi. 17, 18.	,,	iii. 19, 20.
25.	,,	xiv. 13-21.	,,	vi. 30-44.	,,	ix. 10-17.
26.	,,	xvi. 13-28.	,,	viii. 27-ix. 1.	,,	ix. 18-27.
27.	,,	xvii. 1-8.	,,	ix. 2-8.	,,	ix. 28-36.
28.	,,	xvii. 14-18.	,,	ix. 14-27.	,,	ix. 37-43.
29.	,,	xvii. 22, 23.	,,	ix. 30-32.	,,	ix. 43-45.
30.	,,	xviii. 1-5.	,,	ix. 33-41.	,,	ix. 46-50.
31.	,,	xix. 13-15.	,,	x. 13-16.	,,	xviii. 15-17.
32.	,,	xix. 16-30.	,,	x. 17-31.	,,	xviii. 18-30.
33.	,,	xx. 17-19.	,,	x. 32-34.	,,	xviii. 31-34.
34.	,,	xx. 29-34.	,,	x. 46-52.	,,	xviii. 35-43.
35.	,,	xxi. 1-9.	,,	xi. 1-10.	,,	xix. 29-38.
36.	,,	xxi. 12, 13.	,,	xi. 15-17.	,,	xix. 45, 46.
37.	,,	xxi. 23-27.	,,	xi. 27-33.	,,	xx. 1-8.
38.	,,	xxi. 33-46.	,,	xii. 1-12.	,,	xx. 9-19.
39.	,,	xxii. 15-22.	,,	xii. 13-17.	,,	xx. 20-26.
40.	,,	xxii. 23-33.	,,	xii. 18-27.	,,	xx. 27-40.
41.	,,	xxii. 41-46.	,,	xii. 35-37.	,,	xx. 41-44.
42.	,,	xxiii. 1-14.	,,	xii. 38-40.	,,	xx. 45-47.
43.	,,	xxiv. 1-36.	,,	xiii. 1-32.	,,	xxi. 5-33.
44.	,,	xxvi. 1-5.	,,	xiv. 1-2.	,,	xxii. 1, 2.
45.	,,	xxvi. 14-16.	,,	xiv. 10-11.	,,	xxii. 3-6.
46.	,,	xxvi. 17-29.	,,	xiv. 12-25.	,,	xxii. 7-23.
47.	,,	xxvi. 36-56.	,,	xiv. 32-52.	,,	xxii. 40-53.
48.	,,	xxvi. 57, 58.	,,	xiv. 53, 54.	,,	xxii. 54, 55.

49.	Matth.—	xxvi. 69-75.	Mark.—	xiv. 66-72.	Luke.—	xxii. 56-71.
50.	,,	xxvii. 1, 2.	,,	xv. 1.	,,	xxiii. 1.
51.	,,	xxvii. 11-23.	,,	xv. 2-14.	,,	xxiii. 2-23.
52.	,,	xxvii. 26.	,,	xv. 15.	,,	xxiii. 24,25.
53.	,,	xxvii. 32.	,,	xv. 21.	,,	xxiii. 26.
54.	,,	xxvii. 33.	,,	xv. 22.	,,	xxiii. 33.[38
55.	,,	xxvii. 34-38.	,,	xv. 24-28.	,,	xxiii. 33,34,
56.	,,	xxvii. 39-56.	,,	xv. 29-41.	,,	xxiii. 35-49.
57.	,,	xxvii. 57-61.	,,	xv. 42-47.	,,	xxiii. 50-56.
58.	,,	xxviii. 1-8.	,,	xvi. 1-8.	,,	xxiv. 1-9.

There are sections common only to two, of which phenomenon we find all the cases possible.

(*a*) Sections and places common only to Matthew and Mark:—

1.	Matthew.—	x. 42.	Mark.—	ix. 41.
2.	,,	xiii. 34, 35.	,,	iv. 33, 34.
3.	,,	xiii. 54-58.	,,	vi. 2-6.
4.	,,	xiv. 6-12.	,,	vi. 21-29.
5.	,,	xiv. 22, 23.	,,	vi. 45, 46.
6.	,,	xiv. 28-36.	,,	vi. 50-56.
7.	,,	xv. 1-20.	,,	vii. 1-23.
8.	,,	xv. 21-29.	,,	vii. 24-31.
9.	,,	xv. 30-39.	,,	viii. 1-10.
10.	,,	xvi. 1-4.	,,	viii. 11-13.
11.	,,	xvi. 5-12.	,,	viii. 14-21.
12.	,,	xvii. 9-13.	,,	ix. 9-13.
13.	,,	xvii. 19-21.	,,	ix. 28, 29.
14.	,,	xviii. 6-9.	,,	ix. 42-48.
15.	,,	xix. 1-9.	,,	x. 1-12.
16.	,,	xx. 20-28.	,,	x. 35-45.
17.	,,	xxi. 17-22.	,,	xi. 11-14, 19-26.
18.	,,	xxii. 34-40.	,,	xii. 28-34.
19.	,,	xxiv. 22-26.	,,	xiii. 20-23.
20.	,,	xxvi. 6-13.	,,	xiv. 3-9.
21.	,,	xxvi. 42-46, 48.	,,	xiv. 39-42, 44.
22.	,,	xxvi. 59-68.	,,	xiv. 55-65.
23.	,,	xxvii. 15-18.	,,	xv. 6-10.

24.	Matthew.—	xxvii. 27-31.	Mark.—	xv. 16-20.
25.	,,	xxvii. 46-49.	,,	xv. 34-36.
26.	,,	xxviii. 7.	,,	xvi. 7.

(*b*) Passages only found in Mark and Luke:—

1.	Mark.—	i. 21-28.	Luke.—	iv. 31-37.
2.	,,	i. 35-39.	,,	iv. 42-44.
3.	,,	i. 45.	,,	v. 15, 16.
4.	,,	ii. 4.	,,	v. 19.
5.	,,	iii. 13-15.	,,	vi. 12, 13.
6.	,,	iv. 21-25.	,,	viii. 16-18.
7.	,,	v. 4.	,,	viii. 27.
8.	,,	v. 9, 10.	,,	viii. 30, 31.
9.	,,	v. 29-33.	,,	viii. 45-47.
10.	,,	v. 35-37.	,,	viii. 48-51.
11.	,,	vi. 15, 16.	,,	ix. 8, 9.
12.	,,	vi. 30, 31.	,,	ix. 10.
13.	,,	viii. 38.	,,	ix. 26.
14.	,,	ix. 38-40.	,,	ix. 49, 50.
15.	,,	xi. 18.	,,	xix. 47, 48.
16.	,,	xii. 41-44.	,,	xxi. 1-4.
17.	,,	xiii. 9, 11.	,,	xxi. 12-15.

(*c*) Parallel passages found only in Matthew and Luke:—

1.	Matthew.—	iv. 3-11.	Luke.—	iv. 3-13.
2.	,,	v. 1-12.	,,	vi. 20-23.
3.	,,	v. 39-48.	,,	vi. 27-36.
4.	,,	v. 18.	,,	xvi. 17.
5.	,,	v. 25, 26.	,,	xii. 58, 59.
6.	,,	vi. 7-13.	,,	xi. 1-4.
7.	,,	vi. 19-21.	,,	xii. 33, 34.
8.	,,	vi. 22, 23.	,,	xi. 34-36.
9.	,,	vi. 24.	,,	xvi. 13.
10.	,,	vi. 25-33.	,,	xii. 22-31.
11.	,,	vii. 1, 2, 3-5, 12, [16-20, 24-27.	,,	vi. 37, 38, 41, 42, [31, 44-49.

12.	Matthew.—	viii. 5-13.	Luke.—	vii. 1-10.
13.	,,	viii. 19-22.	,,	ix. 57-60.
14.	,,	ix. 37, 38.	,,	x. 2.
15.	,,	x. 12, 13.	,,	x. 5, 6.
16.	,,	x. 15.	,,	x. 12.
17.	,,	x. 16.	,,	x. 3.
18.	,,	x. 19, 20.	,,	xii. 11, 12.
19.	,,	x. 24.	,,	vi. 40.
20.	,,	x. 26-33.	,,	xii. 2-9.
21.	,,	x. 34, 35.	,,	xii. 51-53.
22.	,,	xi. 2-19.	,,	vii. 18-35.
23.	,,	xi. 21-23.	,,	x. 13-15.
24.	,,	xi. 25-27.	,,	x. 21, 22.
25.	,,	xii. 23.	,,	xi. 14.
26.	,,	xii. 38-42.	,,	xi. 16, 29-31.
27.	,,	xii. 43-45.	,,	xi. 24-26.
28.	,,	xiii. 33.	,,	xiii. 20, 21.
29.	,,	xviii. 12-14.	,,	xv. 4-7.
30.	,,	xxiii. 37-39.	,,	xiii. 34, 35.
31.	,,	xxiv. 45-51.	,,	xii. 42-48.
32.	,,	xxv. 14-30.	,,	xix. 11-28.

It is obvious that the parallels now adduced from the three Gospels, or from any two of them, will not appear the same in the different lists of critics, in consequence of the different views entertained respecting the principles of a harmony, and the diversity of judgment as to the mode of carrying out those principles in detail. Hence the tables given by Eichhorn, Marsh, Bertholdt, Credner, and Neudecker, differ in various instances, while that which we have just proposed presents considerable diversities from all.

Again, while the matter constituting the body of the three Gospels is the same, there is great diversity in the arrangement of it. Chronological sequence appears not to have entered into the plan of any one of the writers. None of them seems to have been solicitous of presenting it.* Doubtless each had some plan, more or less definite, in composing his Gospel—some method of arrangement in his mind, subservient to the main purpose in

writing—but true chronological sequence did not enter into it. Hence it is not correct to speak, as some do, of *misarrangements* in the Gospels. It is unfair towards the sacred penmen to require of them a thing which they did not mean to do. In the arrangement of facts, Mark generally agrees with Luke rather than Matthew; so that he is nearer, on the whole, to chronological order than the apostle.

For the comparison of *verbal correspondences* in three Gospels, the following passages, selected from those just given, may serve:—

Matt.—iii. 3.	Mark—i. 3.	Luke—iii. 4.
,, iii. 11.	,, i. 7. [44.	,, iii. 16.
,, viii. 2, 3, 4.	,, i. 40, 41, 42,	,, v. 12, 13, 14.
,, viii. 15.	,, i. 31.	,, iv. 39. [24.
,, ix. 2, 4, 5, 6.	,, ii. 5, 8, 9, 10.	,, v. 20, 22, 23,
,, ix. 15.	,, ii. 20.	,, v. 35.
,, ix. 22.	,, v. 34.	,, viii. 48.
,, ix. 24.	,, v. 39.	,, viii. 52.
,, xii. 13.	,, iii. 5.	,, vi. 10.
,, xiv. 19, 20.	,, vi. 41, 42, 43.	,, ix. 16, 17.
,, xvi. 21.	,, viii. 31.	,, ix. 22.
,, xvi. 24, 25, 26.	,, viii. 34, 35, 36, 37.	,, ix. 23, 24, 25.
,, xvi. 28.	,, ix. 1.	,, ix. 27.
,, xvii. 5.	,, ix. 7.	,, ix. 35.
,, xvii. 17.	,, ix. 19.	,, ix. 41.
,, xix. 29.	,, x. 29.	,, xviii. 29.
,, xxi. 12, 13.	,, xi. 15, 17.	,, xix. 45, 46.
,, xxi. 23. [27.	,, xi. 28. [33.	,, xx. 2.
,, xxi. 25, 26,	,, xi. 30, 31, 32,	,, xx. 4, 5, 6, 8.
,, xxi. 42.	,, xii. 10.	,, xx. 17.
,, xxii. 44.	,, xii. 36.	,, xx. 42, 43.
,, xxiv. 6-9.	,, xiii. 7-13.	,, xxi. 9-17.
,, xxiv. 19.	,, xiii. 17.	,, xxi. 23.
,, xxiv. 30.	,, xiii. 26.	,, xxi. 27.
,, xxiv. 35.	,, xiii. 31.	,, xxi. 33.
,, xxvi. 29.	,, xiv. 25.	,, xxii. 18.

Other verbal coincidences in the parallel sections and passages of the three Gospels may be discovered besides the present. There are some very striking examples in such coincident passages, of verbal agreement between two of the evangelists, the third relating the same things in different words. None of these, however, has been adduced, because our object was to select verbal coincidences between the three writers *in sections or passages common to all.* But the verbal coincidences between two Gospels alone are more frequent and striking. Take the following specimens in sections or passages common only to two evangelists:—

Matthew.	xiv. 22, 34.	Mark.	vi. 45, 53.
,,	xv. 7, 8, 9, 10.	,,	vii. 6, 7, 14.
,,	xv. 26, 32.	,,	vii. 27; viii. 1, 2.
,,	xix. 5, 6.	,,	x. 7, 8, 9.
,,	xx. 22-28.	,,	x. 38-45.
,,	xxiv. 22.	,,	xiii. 20.
Mark.	i. 24, 25.	Luke.	iv. 34, 35.
,,	viii. 38.	,,	ix. 26.
,,	ix. 38, 40.	,,	ix. 49, 50.
Matthew.	v. 44.	Luke.	vi. 27, 28.
,,	vii. 5.	,,	vi. 42.
,,	viii. 8, 9, 10.	,,	vii. 6-9.
,,	viii. 20, 22.	,,	ix. 58, 60.
,,	xi. 3-11.	,,	vii. 19-28.
,,	xi. 16-19.	,,	vii. 31-35.
,,	xii. 41-45.	,,	xi. 32, 31, 24, 25, 26.
,,	xiii. 33.	,,	xiii. 20, 21.
,,	xxiii. 37, 38.	,,	xiii. 34, 35.
,,	xxiv. 46, 47, 48, 50.	,,	xii. 43, 44, 45, 46.

Bishop Marsh distinctly pointed out the following phenomena connected with the verbal agreement of the Gospels.

1. The examples in which all three Gospels verbally coincide are not very numerous, and contain in general only one or two, or at most three sentences together.

2. The examples of verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark are very numerous.

3. The examples of verbal agreement between Mark and Luke are not numerous, being but eight in all.

4. The same writer also believed, that throughout the matter common to all three Gospels, there is not a single instance of verbal coincidence between Matthew and Luke, except in the passages where Luke and Mark agree at the same time. But it has been found that this phenomenon is scarcely a fact. The exceptions to it are more than *apparent*, as Credner and Neudecker term them. It is not uncommon to find a closer verbal resemblance in such instances between Luke and Matthew, than between Luke and Mark. De Wette has supplied the following examples, which are sufficiently numerous to set aside the *reality* of the phenomenon believed to have been observed by Marsh. Luke iii. 16, compared with Matt. iii. 11; Luke v. 36, compared with Matt. ix. 16; Luke viii. 43, compared with Matt. ix. 20; Luke ix. 5, compared with Matt. x. 14; Luke xx. 32, compared with Matt. xxii. 27; Luke xx. 44, compared with Matt. xxii. 45; Luke xxii. 6, compared with Matt. xxvi. 16.

5. It escaped the notice of Marsh, that the verbal coincidences are chiefly in reciting the words of Jesus and in the reports of words spoken by others in connection with His language. Where the evangelists speak in their own person, such verbal agreement is rare, at least to any perceptible extent; but where they profess to repeat the words of others, it often appears.

But here it ought to be observed, that the portions of the Gospels in which the words of others are repeated, bear a small proportion to the narrative parts. If, for instance, the Gospels be separated into two divisions, the one consisting of the recital of others' words, the second of the evangelists' statements of facts, the extent of the latter will be much greater than that of the former. Mr. Norton, who has examined this subject with his usual ability, finds the proportion of verbal coincidence in the narrative part of Matthew, compared with what exists in the other part, to be as one to more than two; in Mark as one to four; and in Luke as one to ten.

6. Verbal coincidences are also chiefly found in predictions

from the Old Testament, though much seldomer than in the case just mentioned.

Here it should be recollected, that the sacred writers usually quoted from the Septuagint.

Various hypotheses have been proposed to account for these correspondences.

i. That they were derived from a common written source, or sources.
ii. That the earlier Gospels were consulted in the composition of the latter.
iii. That they were derived from oral tradition.
iv. Some have combined the last two opinions, making a composite view out of them.

i. Le Clerc seems to have been the first who threw out the hint that several writings composed by eye and ear-witnesses were used in the composition of the canonical Gospels. After him Semler, in his notes to Townson on the Gospels, thought that one or more original Syro-Chaldaic documents were employed. About the same time, Lessing fixed on *the Gospel of the Hebrews* as the common source, in which idea he was followed by Niemeyer, Weber, and Thiess. It has also quite recently found favour in the eyes of the Tübingen school, who derive Matthew's Gospel in particular from the so called *Gospel of the Hebrews*, which they exalt as *the earliest document* employed by the primitive Christians. Here Schwegler[a] has laboured most, but very unsuccessfully, as Franck[b] has shewn in an able essay inserted in the *Studien und Kritiken*. The first who drew general attention to the subject was Eichhorn, by the ingenuity of his speculations and the interesting style in which they were exhibited. Hence he may be appropriately designated the parent of the hypothesis of an *original written Gospel* containing all the statements common to the first three canonical Gospels.

It was first proposed in the fifth volume of his Universal Library

[a] See his Review of De Wette's Einleit. in das N. T. in Zeller's Theol. Jahrbuch, 1843, Heft. 3; and Nachapostolisches Zeitalter, vol. i. p. 201, et seqq.
[b] Studien und Kritiken for 1848, Heft 2.

of Biblical Literature, in a form comparatively simple, as may be seen from the following genealogy:—

1. An original Aramaean Gospel. 2. A revised edition of it A, the basis of Matthew. 3. Another revised edition of No. 1, B, the basis of Luke. 4. A new edition of 1, composed of A and B, termed C, the basis of Mark. 5. Another revision D, used by Matthew and Luke where they agree with one another but differ from Mark. It is easy however to see, that this form of the hypothesis is quite insufficient to account for the verbal coincidences in *Greek* Gospels, especially the very remarkable correspondences in the use of rare and peculiar Greek expressions, which obviously point to a Greek source, and are very difficult to be explained as independent renderings from an Aramaean original.

After Eichhorn, the idea was taken up by Marsh, who elaborated an hypothesis of his own with extreme ingenuity and acuteness, educing the following results:—

Several years before any of our canonical Gospels was composed, a short narrative was drawn up in Aramaean, containing the principal transactions in the life of Jesus Christ from His baptism to His death. This he calls א. The document was soon translated into Greek $\bar{\text{א}}$. In process of time, additional circumstances relative to transactions already recorded in א, or transactions entirely unnoticed, were inserted in the text. A copy thus augmented he marks $\text{א}+\alpha+A$; while another copy similarly enlarged with other additions would be $\text{א}+\beta+B$; and a third, with other additions, $\text{א}+\gamma+\Gamma$. In addition to א, which contained a series of facts, another sketch was drawn up, containing a collection of precepts, parables, and discourses delivered by Christ, ב. This supplemental *Γνωμολογια* was in Aramaean only, and the copies of it differed from one another. According to this genealogy, Matthew's Hebrew Gospel was made from $\text{א}+\alpha+\gamma+A+\Gamma+\text{ב}$; the Gospel of Luke from $\text{א}+\beta+\gamma+B+\Gamma+\text{ב}+\bar{\text{א}}$; and Mark's from $\text{א}+\alpha+\beta+A+B+\bar{\text{א}}$. The Greek Gospel of Matthew was a literal version of the Aramaean; in addition to which those of Mark and Luke were consulted, as also $\bar{\text{א}}$.

Stimulated by the speculations of Marsh, and anxious to remove the objections made to his hypothesis, Eichhorn appeared again

with a new and more comprehensive scheme developed at length, of which the following is an abstract:—

Four recensions of the Syro-Chaldaic original formed the basis of the three canonical Gospels, the three oldest of which are A, B, and D.

A was enlarged with some of the greater additions in Matthew; and of it a Greek version was early made.

B was enriched with some of the greater additions in Luke. Of it there was no early Greek version.

D was enriched with some other of the larger additions in Luke. Of it a Greek translation was early made.

C was a new recension made from A and B, enriched with all the larger additions in both.

Matthew's Hebrew text was composed of A and B; but since in *the first part*, the sections of the original Gospel, together with the additions with which it was enlarged from A and D, were incorrect in regard to time and place; and since in *the last part* some of the additions taken from D were also in improper places, Matthew transposed them, and brought them into a new connection with the original Gospel by means of new transitions. Thus the Aramaic Gospel (E) of Matthew arose.

The translator of Matthew made use of the Greek versions of A and D already existing.

The recension C forms the basis of Mark's Gospel; but he used also the existing version of A. The additions which C had received from B he must have translated for himself.

From B and D was composed a Syro-Chaldaic text F, which Luke translated. In translating, he made use of the Greek version of D; but he must have rendered independently what belonged to B. He also inserted a translation of several detached pieces, and made additions of his own.

The hypothesis was approved by Ziegler, Häulein, Kuinoel, Bertholdt, and Gratz, the latter writer having simplified it somewhat, in the following method:—1. A Hebrew original Gospel. 2. A Greek original Gospel arising from it, with many additions. 3. Shorter evangelical documents. 4. Mark and Luke were composed from 2, in addition to which 3 was consulted. 5. The Hebrew Matthew which sprung from 1, with additions which the writer

made independently in part, and also borrowed from a document agreeing partially with the Gnomology used by Luke. 6. A Greek version of the Hebrew Matthew, in making which the Gospel of Mark was consulted, and additions taken from it. 7. Interpolations in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, by a transference of many sections to the one out of the other[c].

The principal point in which Gratz's opinion differs from those of Eichhorn and Marsh is, that according to it the Aramaean original Gospel formed the basis of Matthew's Hebrew Gospel; while a Greek original Gospel, chiefly a translation of the former, was the principal source of Mark and Luke. But in avoiding some of the objections to which the views of his predecessors were exposed, the hypothesis of this writer opens the way for others peculiar to itself; so that, on the whole, it is not more plausible than they.

There are several objections that lie in common against the hypothesis of an original Gospel, which readily occur to every mind.

First. Antiquity furnishes no trace of the historical existence of such a document. There is a total silence regarding it. This is remarkable when we consider the alleged importance of it. Had it been the common basis of our canonical Gospels, more attention would have been paid to it. It could scarcely have been so soon forgotten and lost. That the first Christians could have allowed it to drop into oblivion is incongruous with their mental habits. It must have been treasured up and appealed to as sacred in their eyes — the pure fountain whence the evangelists drew their common matter.

Secondly. The meagreness and brevity of the document would be so far a barrier to its general reception, as well as to the authority assigned to it. That it must have been fragmentary and very imperfect is apparent to any one who will examine the forty-two sections common to the three Gospels in which it was contained.

Thirdly. The particular object with which it was written at first is inconceivable, as well as inexplicable. It could not have

[c] Neuer Versuch die Entstehung der drei ersten Evangelien zu erklären, 8vo., 1812.

been drawn up with the view of furnishing materials for a future history, since the apostles were alive, and could have furnished ampler accounts; while Matthew himself is thus supposed to have consulted a document to which he had contributed. And if it contained *materials* for a history, as Marsh alleges, why was a translation made of it in its imperfect state? Why should it have become current, and attained so much reputation as to have furnished in various copies of it, the canonical Gospels? In short, it is not only difficult to describe its nature and form, but impossible to extract it at present out of the common sections of the Gospels, in any shape that could have been intelligible, while it is equally difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain the particular purpose it was intended to serve.

Fourthly. The complexity and artificial character of the hypothesis afford a strong presumption against it. The combinations of circumstances supposed, are singular. The various processes through which each Gospel passed in its formation, till, from the imperfect substance of it lying in the common document, it became what it now is, are attended with peculiar coincidences of motives and procedure which seem highly artificial, and in some points unnatural. In the genealogies by which the canonical Gospels are traced up to the original document, few steps are unattended with a puzzling perplexity, which creates a suspicion of radical unsoundness in the entire hypothesis.

Fifthly. The preface of Luke's Gospel is wholly silent concerning the document in question. It is even inconsistent with its existence. Nor is it less strange that Papias should never have hinted at it; but, on the contrary, have written in a manner shewing his ignorance of the fact that it had been the basis of our present Gospels.

Sixthly. All the phenomena are not satisfactorily explained by the hypothesis. For instance, it has been observed by Veysie[d], that in the sections common to the three evangelists, or to Matthew and Mark only, it will not account for those passages in which, though the substance is the same, the words are so different, that they cannot be literally rendered into another

[d] Examination of Mr. Marsh's hypothesis respecting the origin of our first three canonical Gospels, 8vo. 1808.

language so as to produce an exact verbal coincidence. It will not suffice to answer, that the translators took considerable liberties with the text; because this can hardly be predicated of them in regard to the words of Christ, which exhibit verbal discrepancies as well as the narrative portions.

These objections might be enlarged were it necessary, so as to shew their antagonism to the particular forms of the hypothesis proposed by Eichhorn and Marsh. Others will occur to the reader, which might be urged with more or less plausibility. But since the entire scheme is generally abandoned at the present day, we may be allowed thus briefly to dispose of it, without going over ground ably trodden by others, or repeating objections urged against it by writers in England and Germany. Criticism has well nigh banished it from the field, making it a matter of bygone history.

As to that form of the hypothesis which assumes the existence of *several* independent original Gospels as common sources of the synoptists, it has been advocated, after Le Clerc, by Koppe, Semler, Schleiermacher, Kaiser, Rettig, and others. But it is easy to dispose of it, after the other has been examined. To attempt to account for the harmony of plan existing in the three canonical Gospels in this manner, as well as for the verbal correspondences, were a fruitless task. At every step we should be obliged to attribute arbitrary caprice to the sacred writers. They would sink to the level of artificial, mechanical compilers; and the problem would remain unsolved.

ii. Many have accounted for the correspondences by supposing that the writers copied more or less freely from one another, the last of the three making use of the other two. Some have called this the *supplementary* hypothesis, because they have an objection to the use of the word *copyist* or *transcriber* as applied to any of the sacred writers. But by whatever appellation it be distinguished, thus much is freely admitted and assumed, that one evangelist made use of another while writing his Gospel, adapting his own production in a particular manner to one or two prior.

There are six possible cases of the view under consideration.

1. Mark copied from Matthew, and Luke from both. So Grotius[e], Mill[f], Wetstein[g], Townson[h], Seiler[i], Hug[k], and others.

2. Luke copied from Matthew, and Mark from both. So Dr. H. Owen[l], Stroth[m], Griesbach[n], Ammon[o], Saunier[p], Theile[q], Fritzsche[r], Sieffert[s], Gfrörer[t].

3. Matthew followed Mark, and Luke both. So Storr[u] in part, but not wholly.

4. Luke copied from Mark, and Matthew from both. This is maintained in a peculiar way by Weisse[x], Wilke[y], B. Bauer[z], and Hitzig[a].

5. Matthew transcribed from Luke, and Mark from both. So Büsching[b], and Evanson[c].

6. Mark copied from Luke, and Matthew from both. So Vogel[d].

Let us examine the hypothesis in some of these forms.

(*a*) We shall consider the opinions that Mark made use of Matthew alone; and that he made use of both Matthew and Luke.

It is almost superfluous to state, that Mark is not an *epitomiser* of Matthew, as Augustine erroneously styles him. It could not have been his purpose to shorten the Gospel of his predecessor, because that is inconsistent with the character of his own. Where he departs from him, or alters his narratives, he enlarges oftener

[e] Annotatt. ad Matth. i. 1, Luc. i. 1.
[f] Prolegomena in N. T., §§ 109, 116.
[g] N. Test., vol. i. pp. 224, 552, 643.
[h] Discourses on the Four Gospels, Discourse the third.
[i] De tempore et ordine quo tria evang. priora canonica scripta sunt. 4to. 1805-6.
[k] Einleit. zweiter Theil, p. 62, et seqq.
[l] Observations on the Four Gospels, p. 32, et seqq.
[m] In Eichhorn's Repertorium, ix. p. 144.
[n] Opuscula, ad. Gabler, vol. ii. p. 385, et seqq.
[o] Dissertatio de Luca emendatore Matthaei, 8vo. 1805.
[p] Ueber die Quellen des Evangelium's des Markus, 8vo. 1825.
[q] De trium priorum evangeliorum necessitudine, 8vo. 1825.
[r] Prolegomena in Commentar. in Marc. p. 35, et seqq.
[s] Ueber den Ursprung des ersten kanonischen Evangel. p. 3.
[t] Die heilige Sage, 8vo. 1838.
[u] Commentatio de fontibus evangeliorum Matthaei et Lucae. 8vo. 1794.
[x] Evangelische Geschichte. [y] Der Urevangelist. 8vo. 1838.
[z] Kritik der evang. Geschichte d. Synoptiker, vol. i. pp. 253. 257.
[a] Ueber Joh. Markus, p. 37, et seqq.
[b] Harmonie der Evangelisten, preface.
[c] Dissonance of the four generally received evangelists.
[d] In Gabler's Journal, i. 1, p. 1, et seqq.

than he abridges them. If then he did not mean to epitomise Matthew, it may be asked, What was his precise object? Here two suppositions present themselves. He either intended that his work should be a new and revised or improved edition of Matthew's, the effect of whose circulation would naturally be to supersede the apostle's; or a supplement to it, which by accompanying, might render it more useful. In the former case it is very difficult to account for the numerous omissions, especially of parables and short discourses, which his Gospel exhibits. It is possible indeed that his plan of an entire Gospel may have embraced a narrower range of discourses than Matthew's; but then we should not have expected the omission of any facts or parables, after the specimens inserted in the Gospel. In the latter case, it is difficult to explain the origin of the brevity with which he records many things that are narrated more copiously in Matthew. The omissions and curtailments cannot be ascribed to one and the same cause. By *abridging* sections in Matthew's work, he could only have intended to make his Gospel independent and complete of itself, a design inconsistent with the fact of his omitting several things entirely. By *omitting* sections and passages in Matthew's production, he must have been fully satisfied with it, and have therefore meant to supply deficiencies, which latter purpose, however, is inconsistent with the fact of his curtailing narratives in the Gospel of his predecessor. Thus the supplementary hypothesis is insufficient to explain all the phenomena, for while it may account for the numerous circumstantial particulars, and may even consist with the total omission of discourses and parables, it cannot explain at the same time the condensation and abridgment of other events and particulars.

There are considerable difficulties even in regard to the omissions. On what principle, it may be asked, were certain portions of the evangelical history omitted and others retained? Hug charges them to the account of Peter, Mark's voucher, who did not allow them the position they occupy in Matthew[e]. This explanation might be admitted, on the supposition of the apostle taking care that all the parts of Mark's Gospel should be arranged in their right chronological sequence. Yet the second Gospel is not

[e] Einleit, ii. p. 110.

always chronological. Mark does not uniformly rectify Matthew's historical transpositions. Thus there is certainly a historical transposition in Matt. ix. 10-17, which is also related out of its true chronological place by Mark. Cases are not wanting in which Mark has displaced what Matthew unquestionably puts in its true connection, of which chapter xiii. 10 affords an example. Does not this explanation of Hug's also make the mere position of circumstances of greater importance than was attached to it by the sacred writers themselves? It could only account for a *transposition* of portions in Mark's Gospel, but not for their total omission, except on the ground derogatory to Peter, viz. that though he did not allow to some events the place they occupied in Matthew, he was unable to direct Mark in assigning them their true position, and therefore they were omitted. Greswell endeavours to account for the omissions, by affirming that whatever might be known with sufficient clearness, definiteness, and fulness from his predecessor, was left out by the evangelist[f]. But this is neutralised by the fact, that Mark has repeated things already contained in Matthew without additional particulars, and with no advantage in point of perspicuity. Thus Mark vi. 45-51 is not more lucid or definite than the corresponding narration in Matt. xiv. 22-28. Nay, instead of making Matthew's narrative more definite, the reverse is sometimes apparent. Thus in Mark x. 2, his omission of the phrase *κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν* is not for the better, because the Jews were freely allowed to divorce their wives by the law, and therefore there was no point of temptation in the question put to Jesus. But the essential circumstance of it is given by Matthew in *κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν*. Again, in Mark xii. 35, etc., Mark apparently adduces, as part of Christ's teaching in the temple, what is inappropriate except as addressed to the Pharisees in the way of disputation. Hence Matthew, in introducing the words, rightly has *συνηγμένων δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων*, whereas Mark by the omission has created some obscurity. Thus the alleged ground of Mark's omissions, viz. that the portions so treated might be known from Matthew, is invalidated by the fact, that he has repeated several events in the life of Christ, which are as clearly and as well described by the apostle as they are by the

[f] Dissertations, etc., vol. i.

evangelist. Indeed it is quite improbable that the one cause is equally applicable to *all* omissions—to sermons, parables, and facts.

There are difficulties again in connection with *the abridgments*. Hug accounts for the condensation of Matthew's statements in some cases, by supposing that Mark did not consider it necessary, or was unable to add any thing to them; but his total omission of various sections is opposed to the conjecture. Why did he not omit what he has abridged, as he has omitted other things, if he did not think it necessary, or was unable to subjoin any thing worth mentioning? Besides, instances might be adduced where his condensation or abridgment is certainly not for the better; where the surrounding parts of a narrative are as clearly related by Matthew, and where even something is omitted by Mark necessary to a full and accurate perception of the whole. Thus in Mark ix. 37, etc. the omission of what is presented in Matt. xviii. 3, 4. detracts from the propriety and symmetry of the whole. It will not suffice to say, that the third and fourth verses might be known from Matthew's Gospel, and are therefore omitted; for the same remark may be applied to the second and fifth verses also, which are as perspicuously written by Matthew as by Mark. The reply would thus prove too much. Nor will it avail to say, that the condensed or abridged parts were necessary to constitute along with the new particulars furnished *a proper Gospel*, reasons for their insertion being always found in the context. This would be putting ingenuity to a hard test. The candid inquirer, who has more love for truth than a favourite system, will not be satisfied with ingenious conjectures.

But *the verbal coincidences* are supposed to afford the strongest proof of the fact that the one copied from the other. And yet along with such correspondences, and intersecting them, are *slight* variations, as well as *more important* ones, for which it is impossible to account on this hypothesis. If, as has been supposed, they evince Mark's revisal of his predecessor with the freedom of an original author, that freedom can only be attributed to Peter, since it is utterly improbable that an evangelist would have ventured to alter words in the speeches of Christ himself. And that Peter could have prompted or allowed of this change is inconsistent with the character of Matthew, who was both an

eye-witness of the events, and an original writer. In the narrative parts, the freedom of alteration bears a very small proportion in frequency to its occurrence in the language used by Christ, which Peter could scarcely deem himself able to correct or improve.

Let us consider *the nature* of the variations in Mark's language from that of Matthew, whether by additional words or some other change. We should expect Mark either to translate accurately and closely, or else by paraphrasing to make an improvement in the diction. But this he has not always done. The change is sometimes trivial, imparting neither perspicuity to the sense, nor elegance to the words. It is true that he often supplies words which improve the diction as it stands in the Gospel of his predecessor; but the reverse also takes place. Thus he has made indefinite and obscure, if not unintelligible to us, the transaction respecting the barren fig-tree, by adding *οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων* (Mark xi. 13), which have been tortured into artificial explanations. Again, why are the terms *ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν* (xii. 23), which Griesbach and other editors rightly retain, added to the *ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει* of Matthew? Are they not purely tautological, imparting no perspicuity to the context. The same remark may be applied to *ἧς ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεός* in xiii. 19, which are wholly superfluous as compared with Matthew's words. And then *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας* is even more obscure than Matthew's *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρα*, or rather the original Aramaean of it.

It is objected, we know, that it is unreasonable to make Mark a mere copyist—that his *individuality* should not be denied by the side of his transcribing from Matthew. But we do not infringe on his individuality or independence of character by seeking for an improvement when he makes an alteration; for to affirm that he had no other motive than caprice in various instances—that he did not copy fully and perfectly, but departed from the diction of the Gospel before him for no definite reason but from the mere love of variety, is derogatory to his true position.

Let us next look at Mark as using both Matthew and Luke. Here the first idea that suggests itself is the absence of an adequate motive for inducing the evangelist, with the two Gospels before him, to undertake the composition of another; especially as there are

not more than twenty-seven verses in the whole production containing absolutely new matter. We have already shewn, that he could not have intended to compose a supplement to Matthew's Gospel; and it is as difficult to conceive, that he could have meant to produce a supplement to both Matthew and Luke; else the additions would have been considerable. In fact, it is not easy to assign a definite purpose to Mark in undertaking the writing of a Gospel, on the presumption that those of Matthew and Luke were before him, else its contents would have presented a different appearance, varying much more than they do from the matter and diction of the prior documents.

Consider the omissions on this hypothesis. What could have induced Mark to omit several sections found in Matthew and Luke? Perhaps the answer will be, that he was satisfied with them as contained in those Gospels, being unable to add anything which could render them more definite or full. But this is neutralised by the fact, that he has repeated narratives in no fuller or more definite form than the other two evangelists. Thus the account of Levi's feast, as given by Mark, contains no particulars absent from Matthew and Luke, whose Gospels are equally definite, full, and clear, in this section. There is no improvement on them. On the contrary, one verse given by Matthew, which is important to the understanding of the twelfth, i. e. the thirteenth verse (Matth. ix. 9—13.), is omitted by our evangelist. If it be affirmed that he omitted it, because it might be read in Matthew; then it may be replied, that he might have omitted the whole section, which, if not as full and clear as it is in Matthew, is certainly as definite and complete in Luke's Gospel. Another example of the same kind, to which the same reasoning applies, is the narrative of Jesus' transfiguration in Mark, as compared with the corresponding narratives in Matthew and Luke.

Again, there are apparent discrepancies between Matthew and Luke, which it is not probable Mark would have left in their present state, without adding something that would at least render them easier to be harmonised. When these discrepancies are of such a nature as to be taken for *real* ones by acute and able commentators, the probability becomes very strong. Thus in the account of the healing of the two blind men near Jericho, Matthew

states, that the miracle took place, ἐκπορευομένων ἀπὸ Ἰεριχώ, "as they were *departing from* Jericho," and that there were two; while Luke, who speaks of one, has ἐγγίζειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰεριχώ, "as he *drew near* to Jericho." Here the difficulty is very great in regard to *place*, though slight as regards the *number*, because the mention of one in Luke does not exclude more. The mode of reconciling the apparent discrepancy most readily occurring to the mind of the reader of Matthew and Luke, is to suppose three blind men, two of whom were healed as Jesus left Jericho, the other as he approached the city. But Mark, instead of throwing the smallest light on the circumstance, increases the difficulty by speaking only of one blind man — evidently the same with the one mentioned by Luke — being healed as Jesus *left* the city. In this manner he sets aside the solution of the difficulty which naturally presents itself, and leaves the case worse than it was. Whoever can attribute this procedure to the evangelist, has singular notions of Mark writing a Gospel; for, instead of furnishing something that should serve to harmonise the varying statements, he has only contributed to strengthen the opinion of those who deem the discrepance *real*.

(*b*) Let us now try the hypothesis by supposing that Luke copied from Mark, or from Matthew and Mark. It is true that Mark and Luke often agree in the arrangement of their facts; but then Luke has much new matter not contained in Mark. Besides, if Luke intended to make use of Mark's Gospel, it is reasonable to suppose that he would have intimated it in his preface; especially as it is there implied, that the accounts then in existence relative to the transactions which form the subject of his Gospel, were imperfect, and that he could give information which might be depended on with more confidence.

But it may be deemed more probable, that Luke copied from Matthew and Mark, an opinion ably advocated by Hug. It were superfluous on the present occasion to disprove his interpretation which refers the words αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου to Matthew and Mark alone, the verb παρέδοσαν meaning delivery *by writing*. If authentic histories of Jesus' life written by Matthew and Mark existed, and the many had erred in departing from them, what reason could Luke have had for writing a new history

to correct the imperfections of the many writers who had attempted the task? Were not those of Matthew and Mark quite sufficient? Could he not have referred Theophilus to them? Were they not able to impart *ἀσφάλεια*? It is clear that Luke did not consider them capable of communicating such *ἀσφάλεια*, and therefore the two authentic documents of Matthew and Mark could not have been intended by the words *καθὼς παρέδοσαν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου.*

What then could have been Luke's motive in compiling a new Gospel, chiefly from those of Matthew and Mark? It could not have been to produce a work having greater historical fidelity, because this is inconsistent with the authority of these two, one of which was written by an apostle and eye-witness, the other under the sanction of Peter, an apostle also. And yet this is the avowed design of Luke, if Matthew and Mark be included in the *πολλοί*. Neither can any adequate motive be attributed to him on the supposition that Matthew and Mark alone are meant by the *αὐτόπται*, which does not throw censure directly or indirectly on the authentic histories of these writers, or is not inconsistent with his own professed design. Besides, the omissions of Luke are inexplicable on the hypothesis in question. That he did not mean to abbreviate the histories of his predecessors is apparent from his own words, as it is incongruous with their import. The most remarkable omission consists of a chain of events contained in Matth. xiv. 22-xvi. 39, and Mark vi. 45-viii. 10. It is impossible to present any plausible explanation of this omission on the ground of the hypothesis before us; because it is contrary to Luke's manner to omit an event entirely. Hug has hazarded a singular conjecture to account for it, by supposing that this portion of the history was lost at an early period. The series of occurrences in the other evangelists, wanting in Luke, terminated with the feeding of the four thousand, while the event immediately preceding the series was the miracle of feeding five thousand. Hence, it is conjectured, that the transcriber of Luke connected by mistake the event immediately following the feeding of the four thousand with that of the five thousand instead, and thus the intervening matter was unintentionally omitted by a *Homoioteleuton*[5]. What-

[5] Einleitung, ii. p. 149.

ever ingenuity belongs to this conjecture, it imagines an unparalleled case. Omissions by a *Homoioteleuton* are commonly brief; and no example extending to so great a length can be produced. The transcriber must have been unusually dull or careless not to have perceived the mistake. The remedy is too desperate for the disease, and is, on every view of it, extremely improbable.

Again, Luke does not always rectify the historical transpositions of the preceding evangelists, nor ascertain what is indefinite in them, nor repeat their narratives with more clearness or fulness, as we have a right to expect from him, if his Gospel be regarded as supplementary. In some cases, he seems to have given a passage in a connexion and with an application not only different from Matthew, but less likely to be the real one, because in the new position assigned to it, some obscurity is created. This is quite consistent with his inspiration, if he did not purpose to write chronologically, which indeed can never be predicated of him with truth. As an example of this nature, we refer to Luke xii. 57-59, where the words—"Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right? When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence till thou hast paid the very last mite"—are introduced in a very different connection from that of Matthew; a connection, where they can only be explained with difficulty, because the train of ideas is obscure. Their position in the first Gospel is natural. There they are easily understood and obviously appropriate. Not so however in regard to Luke, where they introduce indefiniteness and obscurity. Some indeed have attempted to shew their adaptation in Luke, as Olshausen does; but the effort is laboured and unsatisfactory. Others have assumed, that the words in question were repeated by Jesus on two different occasions; but in the present case that is improbable.

Neither can it be shewn, that the important section in Luke xiii. 10-xvii. 10 is chronological and consecutive. That the evangelist does not always define what is ambiguous in Matthew and Mark, may be seen from a comparison of the three accounts of the epileptic

boy, where Luke adds nothing to the two narratives of his predecessors. Mark's is fuller and more circumstantial by itself; much more when it is combined with that given by Matthew. Mark says, that the boy had a dumb spirit, but leaves it uncertain whether the dumbness was periodical or constant. Luke does not define this point. Christ says, φέρετε αὐτὸν πρός με, which is indefinite, referring either to the father and the bye-standers, or to the disciples; but Luke, instead of assisting us to know which is meant, puts a singular verb into the mouth of Jesus, προσάγαγε, which perplexes the mind, because it applies to one person, i. e. the father. Again, the precise application of the words ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη is obscure both in Matthew and Mark (xvii. 17, and ix. 19); but it is left equally so in Luke, although it would have been easy to have specified it by a single word after ἀποκριθείς. Some perhaps may look on these points as too minute and trifling to be adduced; but when taken in connection with the fact that the whole narrative of Luke is neither more circumstantial nor perspicuous than those of Matthew and Mark, the fact is significant. For, unless Luke purposed to repeat narratives where he could make no improvement, or at least none sufficient to justify a repetition, it is impossible to conceive of his doing so to supplement other authentic histories.

Other difficulties in the way of the hypothesis might be derived from the abridgements of narratives in Luke which are narrated more fully in the other two Gospels; but it may be sufficient to state, that the form of it which supposes Luke to have made use of Matthew and Mark, cannot be adopted till it be shewn, that he has in all cases rectified the sequence, where it is unchronological in them; that he has repeated things with improvements in the way of addition, explanation, or definiteness; or that he has uniformly refrained from repeating various particulars in the evangelical history, where there could be no visible rectification. We believe that it is impossible to prove any of these points, and are therefore constrained to admit that he wrote independently.

Having examined the most plausible forms of the hypothesis, it would be a work of supererogation to state the objections which lie against the others; especially as they are analogous to those already indicated. We cannot indeed seriously persuade ourselves,

that any one who sits down with unbiassed mind, and looks at the Gospels arranged in harmony, will embrace the hypothesis. *Diversity* in arrangement and matter, but especially in style and phraseology, is so intermingled with *correspondence*—the discrepances so interlace the agreements in every possible variety, that it is hard to believe the assumption that any one copied from another or from two; or that he revised them; or that he intended to supplement them in a particular method. The individuality of each writer can scarcely be lost sight of in the midst of very close verbal correspondences. The coincidences in diction seldom continue throughout a single verse at a time. They are limited to broken parts of sentences. They are separated by discrepances in every mode. There is a zig-zag line of variations running through that of the correspondences, shewing that the writer was not dependent on the matter, much less the language, of his predecessor or predecessors. For copying of so capricious a kind, it is impossible to assign any motive. It is pervaded by no *principle* of selection. It is like the play of arbitrary caprice, without any perceptible aim or purpose. If the writers were actuated by a certain design in their work of transcribing, revising, or supplementing, it is impossible to discover it. They have been able to hide it so effectually, as to elude the notice of all subsequent inquirers. They were the most acute and the shrewdest authors. The performance of their task demanded consummate skill. But all this is inconsistent with the known character and habits of the men themselves, unlettered as they were, without artificiality of intellect or purpose. It is unreasonable to transfer the ingenuity of modern speculation to them;—or to attribute to them the comprehensive, well-defined plans of ordinary writers, whose eyes are kept constantly awake lest they commit some error in carrying out their design through every minute part of their production.

In order to shew the untenableness of the hypothesis in every form, we should be willing to take the corresponding narratives of the same event in two or three of the Gospels, and present them *fully* to *the eye* of the candid inquirer. Let him look at them just as they are – in their verbal coincidences intersected by variations in every possible mode—and we doubt not of his decision against the

opinion of one writer having another document or two others before him, and conforming *his own* Gospel in some particular way to it or them, with a certain object in view. Let us therefore present the three accounts of the healing of the paralytic man at Capernaum.

Mark ii. 1-12.	Luke v. 17-26.
1 *Καὶ πάλιν εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καπερναοὺμ δι' ἡμερῶν· καὶ ἠκούσθη, ὅτι εἰς οἶκόν ἐστι.*	17 *Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων· καὶ ἦσαν καθήμενοι Φαρισαῖοι καὶ νομοδιδάσκαλοι, οἳ ἦσαν ἐληλυθότες ἐκ πάσης κώμης τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ· καὶ δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτούς.*
2 *Καὶ εὐθέως συνήχθησαν πολλοί, ὥστε μηκέτι χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν· καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον.*	
Matth. ix. 2-8.	Mark ii.
2 *Καὶ ἰδού, προσέφερον αὐτῷ παραλυτικὸν ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον.*	3 *Καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν φέροντες, αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων.* 4 *Καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι προσεγγίσαι αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην, ὅπου ἦν, καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσι τὸν κράββατον, ἐφ' ᾧ ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκει-*
Matth. ix.	
καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν εἶπε τῷ παραλυτικῷ· θάρσει, τέκνον· ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου	5 *το. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ· τέκνον, ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου.*
3 *Καὶ ἰδού, τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων εἶπον*	6 *Ἦσαν δέ τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ δια-*
	18 *Καὶ ἰδού, ἄνδρες φέροντες ἐπὶ κλίνης ἄνθρωπον, ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος, καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν εἰσενεγκεῖν καὶ θεῖναι ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ.* 19 *Καὶ μὴ εὑρόντες ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτόν, διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα διὰ τῶν κεράμων καθῆκαν αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ εἰς τὸ μέσον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.*
	20 *Καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἄνθρωπε, ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου·* 21 *Καὶ ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρι-*

Matth. ix.	Mark ii.	Luke v.
ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· οὗτος βλασφημεῖ.	λογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς 7 καρδίαις αὐτῶν· τί οὗτος οὕτω λαλεῖ βλασφημίας; τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, εἰ μὴ εἷς	σαῖοι λέγοντες· τίς ἐστιν οὗτος, ὃς λαλεῖ βλασφημίας; τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ θεός; 22
4 Καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν· ἵνα τί ὑμεῖς ἐνθυμεῖσθε πονηρὰ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;	8 ὁ θεός; Καὶ εὐθέως ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὕτως αὐτοὶ διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς	Ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν, ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;
5 Τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν· ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειραι καὶ περιπάτει;	9 καρδίαις ὑμῶν; Τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτικῷ· ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειραι καὶ ἆρόν σου τὸν κράββατον καὶ περιπάτει;	23 Τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν· ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου, ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειρα καὶ περιπάτει;
6 Ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας· (τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ·) ἐγερθεὶς 11 ἆρόν σου τὴν κλίνην καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.	10 Ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας· (λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ·) σοὶ λέγω· ἔγειραι καὶ ἆρον τὸν κράββατόν σου καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.	24 Ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας· (εἶπε τῷ παραλελυμένῳ·) σοὶ λέγω· ἔγειραι, καὶ ἆρας τὸ κλινίδιόν σου πορεύου εἰς τὸν οἶκόν
7 Καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἑαυτοῦ	12 Καὶ ἠγέρθη εὐθέως καὶ ἆρας τὸν κράββατον ἐξῆλθεν ἐναντίον πάντων,	25 σου. Καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν, ἆρας ἐφ' ᾧ κατέκειτο, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ δοξά-

Matth. ix.	Mark ii.	Luke v.
8 Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐθαύμασαν καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.	ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι πάντας καὶ δοξάζειν τὸν θεὸν λέγοντας· ὅτι οὐδέποτε οὕτως εἴδομεν.	26 ζων τὸν θεόν. Καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας, καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν· καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου, λέγοντες· ὅτι εἴδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον.

Or, to do full justice to the supplementary hypothesis, let us take the parallel accounts of one transaction given by two evangelists, and present them to the eye in all their force and integrity.

Mark viii.

1 Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, παμπόλλου ὄχλου ὄντος καὶ μὴ

Matth. xv.

ἐχόντων τί φάγωσι, προσκαλεσάμενος [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγει αὐτοῖς·

32 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπε· σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσί μοι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φάγωσι· καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτοὺς νήστεις οὐ θέλω, μήποτε ἐκλυθῶσιν ἐν τῇ

2 σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσί μοι, καὶ οὐκ

3 ἔχουσι τί φάγωσι. Καὶ ἐὰν ἀπολύσω αὐτοὺς νήστεις εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν, ἐκλυθήσονται

33 ὁδῷ. Καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· πόθεν ἡμῖν ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ἄρτοι τοσοῦτοι, ὥστε χορτάσαι ὄχλον τοσοῦ-

34 τον; Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον· ἑπτά, καὶ ὀλίγα

35 ἰχθύδια. Καὶ ἐκέλευσε τοῖς ὄχλοις ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν

36 γῆν. Καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, οἱ δὲ

37 μαθηταὶ τῷ ὄχλῳ. Καὶ ἔφα-

4 μακρόθεν ἥκουσι. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεταί τις ὧδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων

5 ἐπ' ἐρημίας; Καὶ ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους;

6 οἱ δὲ εἶπον· ἑπτά. Καὶ παρήγγειλε τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα παραθῶσι·

7 καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ ὄχλῳ. Καὶ

Matth. xv.

γον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· καὶ ἦραν τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων, ἑπτὰ σπυ-
38 ρίδας πλήρεις. Οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν τετρακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων.

Mark viii.

εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα· καὶ εὐλογήσας εἶπε παραθεῖναι καὶ
8 αὐτά. Ἔφαγον δὲ καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· καὶ ἦραν περισσεύματα κλασμάτων, ἑπτὰ
9 σπυρίδας. Ἦσαν δὲ οἱ φαγόντες ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι. καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτούς.

Matth. viii. 9-13.

9 Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν, ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας, καὶ λέγω τούτῳ· πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται· καὶ ἄλλῳ· ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται· καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου· ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ.
10 Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασε καὶ εἶπε τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πί-
11 στιν εὗρον. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἥξουσι καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ βα-
12 σιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.
13 Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῃ· ὕπαγε, καὶ ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι. καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ.

Luke vii. 8-10.

8 Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος, ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας, καὶ λέγω τούτῳ· πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται· καὶ ἄλλῳ· ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται· καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου· ποίησον τοῦ-
9 το, καὶ ποιεῖ. Ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασεν αὐτόν, καὶ στραφεὶς τῷ ἀκολουθοῦντι αὐτῷ ὄχλῳ εἶπε· λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον.

10 Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ πεμφθέντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον εὗρον τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα δοῦλον ὑγιαίνοντα.

iii. Another hypothesis proposed to account for the coincidences of the first three Gospels is based on oral tradition, which has been set forth as the only common source of the documents with all their striking similarities of plan and language. Herder seems to have been the first who advocated this view. It differs from Eichhorn's in assuming that the original Aramaean Gospel was not a *written* but a *verbal* one, formed among the apostles and their immediate disciples at Jerusalem, which became the norm of the first teachers of Christianity in their announcement of its truths. To this oral type or preaching the written Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, were conformed, and hence their similarity. Thus the fountain was nothing more than the substance of the apostolic preaching, which Herder imagines to have been moulded in a tolerably definite shape for the space of thirty years, before it was committed to writing. In one passage however he speaks of *a private writing* being in the hands of the preachers, which regulated the oral propagation of Christianity; so that, although the common Gospel was a verbal one, unpublished for thirty years, there was a private document containing a *written* sketch, proceeding at first from one of the apostles. This places his hypothesis out of the list of those which assume oral tradition as the exclusive source of the three canonical Gospels. Indeed it is difficult to apprehend the opinion of this writer very clearly; because he speaks somewhat vaguely, if not inconsistently, in various parts of his writings. Hence subsequent authors have given different representations of his views. It does not appear that he had distinct or definite conceptions on the point, else he would have written more perspicuously.

Eckermann[h] thought that the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew embodied the oral accounts of Jesus' history and doctrine, so that Mark and Luke, when collecting materials at Jerusalem, received from eye-witnesses or from teachers, such information as bore a striking resemblance in matter and form to the Gospel of Matthew.

Paulus[i] supposed that the proper designation of *the evangelists*,

[h] Theologische Beiträge, v. 2, p. 148; and die Erklärung aller dunkeln Stellen des Neuen Testamentes, i. preface.

[i] Theologisch-exegetisches Conservatorium, i. p. 165.

mentioned in various parts of the New Testament, was to relate orally the historical parts of the new religion. These *evangelists* he identifies with *the many* mentioned in Luke's preface, who set in order the oral narrative or Gospel there called διήγησις. This took place till our three evangelists put it into writing, enlarging it at the same time with new materials. But the oral Gospel, thus reduced to proper shape and consistence by the first evangelists, was not derived from *mere tradition*, according to Paulus, but from brief written accounts of particular incidents or discourses. Other conjectures were also put forth to explain the resemblances among our present Gospels, which give the hypothesis a complex form, by bringing into it *written* documents, as well as the oral tradition fixed by the εὐαγγελισταί. The ingenious author has even recourse to the supposition that Mark had the Gospels of Matthew and Luke before him.

We deem it unnecessary to refer to the particular sentiments of Sartorius[k] and Kaiser[l], who are likewise the advocates of tradition as the common though not exclusive source of the Gospels; or to Schleiermacher's view[m], which falls substantially under this head, inasmuch as he conceives the detached written narratives from which the Gospels were framed to have flowed from tradition.

Gieseler was the first who drew general attention to the hypothesis of an oral tradition, by the learning and ingenuity with which it was advocated in his well known essay entitled, *Ueber die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien*, published thirty years ago. The copiousness and ability with which it is there proposed have been generally acknowledged; nor is it too much to affirm that it would have fallen into oblivion ere this, had he not commended it to the public in that masterly dissertation.

We shall not detail the modifications adopted by Guerike, Thiersch, and others, who, prudently avoiding the objectionable parts and exclusive character of the hypothesis, endeavour to present the substance of it in a more acceptable form. That

[k] Drei Abhandlungen über wichtige Gegenstände, etc. Götting. 1820.
[l] Biblische Theologie, vol. i. p. 224, et seqq.
[m] Ueber die Schriften des Lucas, ein kritischer Versuch. Berlin, 1817.

there is much truth in it cannot be questioned; but that it contains the whole truth and no more, few will be so bold as to assert. The measure, as well as the adjustment of truth which it exhibits may be fairly canvassed; but that it is absolutely destitute of foundation it were idle to affirm.

iv. Others combine the traditionary hypothesis with that which assumes one evangelist to have made use of another. To this class belong De Wette, Olshausen, and Meyer, who assign the correspondences of the first three Gospels to the combined agency of both causes. It is obvious, that the separate elements here united will be differently viewed in their individual activity, by different minds. Thus Olshausen thinks, that Mark made immediate use of the two Gospels of Matthew and Luke, oral tradition operating in conjunction. De Wette again assigns very considerable power to tradition, but more perhaps to a mutual use of the evangelists. In short, according to the subjective views of authors, they will attribute a different relative power to the agencies, either singly, or in joint operation at the same time. Hence it would be unprofitable to detail the particular opinion of each writer. It is sufficient to class them under one head, as maintaining the combined operation of written Gospels or documents, and of oral tradition. The mode in which Gieseler urged the traditionary hypothesis, and the objections justly made to it as advocated by him, have been favourable to the complex view just mentioned; perhaps they even gave rise to some aspects of it.

The following explanation of the coincidences among our three evangelists is proposed after much reflection. It may not commend itself to universal adoption; but it will be very difficult to advance a hypothesis in all respects satisfactory. The subject seems scarcely to admit of a very lucid solution, being so remote from our time. We can hardly form a justly comprehensive view of the multiplied circumstances which materially affected the evangelical history when it was first preached, and subsequently committed to writing. It is too much to expect a clear explanation which will at once carry conviction to the mind. We must be contented with the best *probable* solution the case allows of, neither seeking nor demanding *demonstration.*

The rudiments of an original oral Gospel were formed in Jerusalem, in the bosom of the first Christian church; and the language of it must have been Aramaean, since the members consisted of Galileans to whom that tongue was vernacular. It is natural to suppose that they were accustomed to converse with one another on the life, actions, and doctrines of their departed Lord, dwelling on the particulars that interested them most, and rectifying the accounts given by one another, where such accounts were erroneous or seriously defective. The apostles, who were eye-witnesses of the public life of Christ, could impart correctness to the narratives, giving them a fixed character in regard to authenticity and form. In this manner an original oral Gospel in Aramaean was formed. We must not however conceive of it as put into the shape of any of our present Gospels, or as being of like extent; but as consisting of leading particulars in the life of Christ, probably the most striking and the most affecting, such as would leave the best impression on the minds of the disciples. The incidents and sayings connected with their divine Master naturally assumed a particular shape from repetition, though it was simply a rudimental one. They were not compactly linked in regular or systematic sequence. They were the oral germ and essence of a Gospel, rather than a proper Gospel itself, at least according to our modern ideas of it.

But the Aramaean language was soon laid aside. When Hellenists evinced a disposition to receive Christianity, and associated themselves with the small number of Palestinian converts, Greek was necessarily adopted. As the Greek-speaking members far outnumbered the Aramaean-speaking brethren, the oral Gospel was put into Greek. Henceforward Greek, the language of the Hellenists, became the medium of instruction. The truths and facts before repeated in Hebrew, were now generally promulgated in Greek by the apostles and their converts. The historical cyclus which had been forming in the church at Jerusalem, assumed a determinate character in the Greek tongue. This resulted from a combination of various circumstances. The traditions incorporated into the cycle could not have derived their conformity from mutual consultation among the apostles. It could not have been conventional and artificial, for the minuteness of

the coincidences is decidedly adverse to the supposition of a formal origin. Peculiar circumstances must have united in bringing it about *spontaneously*. Such circumstances it is important to ascertain, since they were of a kind to produce a striking assimilation of the three evangelists in matter and language. For this purpose let us consider the mode of life pursued by the apostles in Jerusalem after the death of Christ, while they were employed in establishing Christianity in the capital of Judea, and preparing for its dissemination in other lands.

They narrated the life, actions, and sayings of Jesus, the founder of the new religion, to every one who was willing to hear. All that they taught centered in the person, works, and words of the Son of God. He was set forth as a Teacher come from God, possessing the attributes of Deity while living on earth as a man, working miracles in attestation of the divinity of His mission, and announcing the purest principles of morality. His character and person were illustrated by the rehearsal of His works and words. Perhaps the truths which Jesus taught His disciples would be more dwelt on than any other feature of the evangelical history, for in them His religion was embodied. Here His will was chiefly seen—His commandments recognised. More attention therefore would be given to the words of Jesus by His apostles and disciples. Nor is there any reason to doubt that these words would be accurately related. They were sacred in the eyes of His followers. They were the clearest expression of His will. By following them, the work for which themselves had been chosen would be best promoted. But in teaching the nature of Christianity to those who were disposed to listen, the apostles could not dwell on the words of Christ Himself, apart from the occasions which led to them. Hence the actions and events belonging to the life of their Lord would be also narrated. The sayings could not well be separated from the accompanying circumstances. The miracles, for example, were of the greatest importance in attesting the authority of the teaching. The deeds done by Jesus illustrated and confirmed the discourses; and by a character which was often symbolic, they too communicated instruction. Indeed the apostles could not have related the bare

sayings of Jesus apart from His works, without their teaching becoming unintelligible, or without giving a most imperfect view of the Saviour's nature and ministry. In narrating the one they could not omit the other. In whatever light the subject be regarded, events in the life of their Lord must have been described along with His sayings.

It is apparent that many influences would bring about a repetition of the substance of the evangelical history. Occurrences in the life of Christ must have been of the highest interest to the newly awakened feelings of the early converts. With what eagerness would those persons wish to hear them again and again, that the impression might be deep and durable. Every false report mixed up with them they would wish to have corrected, that the true circumstances alone might be remembered. Curiosity too would lead many who were not believers to ask for information concerning the transactions of Jesus' life. Nor can there be a doubt, that the apostles were ready to impart instruction on these points to all with whom they came into contact. Whatever might be the motives which led various classes to seek for accounts of His ministry, it is certain that those who were best able to furnish them were also most willing. It was their high commission to do so. To that work they had been specially set apart.

The separate portions which make up together the evangelical history, would spontaneously assume, by repetition, a definite form. The expressions used in the narration of them would become fixed. The pieces, whether longer or shorter, would come to be presented in a uniform method. The apostles in each other's company would adopt some uniformity in the mode of their teaching. This would be the case, in particular, with respect to Christ's words, or the language of others called forth by Him. Here there would be the greatest desire to furnish a precise counterpart of what was spoken in another tongue. Here the narrators would be most careful not to deviate from the terms employed by the speakers. In quoting passages of the Old Testament, also, they would commonly adopt the same words, or as nearly so as possible, that the verification of the ancient Scriptures in the appearance of Jesus on earth might be distinctly seen.

It has been found, accordingly, that the verbal coincidences are more numerous and striking in these parts of the Gospels; so that fact corresponds with antecedent probability.

We believe, then, that the component portions of the history of Jesus' life on earth were often narrated by the apostles. These authorised teachers dwelt on them, revolving them as the source of their holiest feelings and highest consolation. Their own thoughts turned to them with an interest intense and permanent. They loved to muse on them. They loved to make them known to any who would listen to the communication. They narrated them to doubters and deniers, as well as to the sincere inquirer. They were often called upon to speak of them in different situations, to different hearers. Thus the habit of repetition tended to mould the teachings in a certain determinate form—the most correct form possible—so that they might be accurately related by others who should go forth as evangelists and missionaries, agreeably to the type formed by the apostles. In this way we account, in part, for the remarkable coincidences of the written Gospels embodying oral accounts.

But there were other circumstances which contributed to the uniformity in question. The age was one of illiterate simplicity. The apostles themselves were from the humblest ranks of society. Their abilities and education were tolerably alike. Their susceptibilities for apprehending the scenes they had witnessed were similar; while the poverty of the dialect in which they reported what they had seen and heard, did not admit of much variety. The first preachers aimed at fidelity and truth in their reports of the events they had witnessed, rather than ornament. They had no wish to dress out their descriptions, even had they been capable of doing so; or if the genius of the limited dialect they employed had allowed of scope and amplitude. Besides, they had been accustomed as Jews, to treasure up and hand down traditionally the interpretations of their fathers respecting the law, and must have been disposed to follow the same method in regard to the Christian religion. Nor would the immediate disciples desire to depart from the expressions they had learned from their instructors. On the contrary, they would studiously

attach themselves to the form in which they had become acquainted with the traditions. Such were the circumstances that contributed to produce and perpetuate a stereotype form of the evangelical history. The habits of the apostles—the character of their education—the poverty of the Alexandrian dialect—the mode of oral interpretation to which they had been accustomed as Jews—the age in which they lived—conspired to bring the oral narratives into an archetypal form which was subsequently transferred to the written Gospels.

Another circumstance which may have contributed to the uniformity in question was the existence of written documents before the evangelists began to write. It is highly probable that such memorials, composed by well-meaning men, were accessible to the sacred writers, when we look at the preface of Luke's Gospel, where their existence is affirmed; and although the historian does not say that he used them himself, yet he would scarcely have neglected to avail himself of them in his inquiries. And if they existed in the time of Luke, we may conceive of them as prior to Matthew. We learn, then, that writings were in circulation, which, though not proceeding from apostles or evangelists directly, exhibited much that was true and useful. Perhaps it was unnecessary for Matthew, who was an eye-witness, to resort to them often; but Mark and Luke who were not, might naturally employ them. Matthew himself did not disdain written sources on every occasion; for the genealogy of Jesus as given by him was derived from the public records; while Luke made use of private family documents for the same purpose. It is highly probable then, that in addition to the *κήρυγμα*—the oral Gospel first preached by the apostles and their disciples—written Gospels or records were consulted by the sacred penmen. And that these memoranda partook themselves of uniformity there can be little doubt, because they were derived from eye-witnesses. Attentive hearers, struck with what they heard from the immediate disciples of Jesus, noted down the various particulars with which their minds had been affected, which they afterwards arranged themselves, or were assisted by others in arranging. Thus the unaccredited Gospels preceding our canonical ones, contributed both to produce and perpetuate a determinate type of the oral traditions

delivered at first by the persons whom Jesus selected. In proportion to the sameness of these compositions, the identity of the actual copies consulted, or the approximation of the transcript to apostolic preaching, would be the assimilation of the canonical Gospels, wherever the latter were derived from them. It is not probable that the apostles themselves used private written memoranda, as some have thought. Their habits were not in harmony with the assumption. They did not think of aiding their memories by taking notes of the transactions they had witnessed, or of the discourses of Jesus to which they had listened. The promise, too, in John's Gospel (xiv. 26), is adverse to the supposition, if they remembered it.

Yet with all its uniformity, the oral tradition was not wholly fixed. It could not possibly have been so in minute particulars, as well as the more important portions, except by intentional adaptation. To some extent it was fluctuating. The portions considered to be of less moment were less frequently repeated; and remained therefore less assimilated in form. Personal peculiarities alone would produce a diversity in the written Gospels, though the evangelists drew from a stereotyped oral tradition, unless they were acted on as machines by the Holy Spirit so that their very words were always dictated or controlled. It may seem perhaps inconsistent with this observation, that the account of Jesus' death and resurrection given in the three Gospels presents so few correspondences compared with the other narratives. Was not this history of the highest interest and importance? Could it have failed to be repeated and dwelt on? Should it not therefore have presented the most marked similarities, as belonging to the historic cyclus? Whence, then, arise the very great discrepances running through the description of this event in the three canonical Gospels—discrepances so great as to create much perplexity? In answer to these questions it should be observed, that the facts of the crucifixion and resurrection are related in the same method by the evangelists, the diversities lying in the circumstances attending those facts. And then they took place *at Jerusalem*. They were well known. The apostles at least insisted on them publicly and universally as indubitable facts, without dwelling on the minor circumstances; both because the

latter were adapted to afford little instruction, and because Jerusalem was the locality where they occurred. The greater part of our Lord's ministry was passed at a distance from Jerusalem; and therefore the inhabitants could be little acquainted with the events composing it. But it would have been superfluous for the apostles in their sojourn in the city after the ascension, while teaching the disciples and making converts, or, in other words, while they were unconsciously forming an oral Gospel, to have dwelt on the attendant circumstances of the crucifixion and resurrection. These remarks will also serve to account for the omission in the first three Gospels of the miracle wrought in raising Lazarus; especially as many of the Jews from the capital witnessed it.

Such are the various considerations that indicate the existence of an original oral Gospel possessing a stereotype character to a certain extent, though exhibiting fluctuations and diversities in other respects. A peculiar combination of circumstances tended towards the one result. And yet we are free to confess, that they are not sufficient *of themselves* to account for the remarkable coincidences. De Wette adduces two objections to the traditional hypothesis viewed as the exclusive source of the written Gospels, which are not destitute of weight.

First. — He thinks that it does not account for the coincidence of parallel accounts, which extends not simply to the general conformation and diction, but also to individual terms of rare occurrence, such as *ἀπαιρόμαι, κατακλάω, δυσκόλως, συνθλάω, λικμάω, κολοβόω, ἀνώγεον, ἀμφίβληστρον, ἐπηρεάζω, διαβλέπω, ἔρχομαι ὀπίσω, γεννητὸς γυναικῶν, γεύομαι θανάτου, πτερύγιον, διχοτομέω, τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τίθημι, υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, ὠτίον, ἀφέωνται σοί αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου*, etc. The uniformity of the evangelical tradition cannot be stretched so far; nor could it have reached down to such minute singularities.

Secondly. — The entire plan and compass of our synoptical Gospels cannot be so explained. The apostles and evangelists were accustomed to adduce no more than a cursory outline of the whole evangelical history, as we find in Acts xiii. 24 ff., or separate parts of it, 1 Cor. xv. 1 ff., without disposing it as

a complete evangelical narrative, such as our written gospels present[n].

The English translator of Schleiermacher has mentioned another objection, of more weight, perhaps, than either of those just stated:—

"If I would endeavour," says this writer, "to form a distinct conception of the apostles' life and labours during the period of their joint abode at Jerusalem, according to the memoirs we have left of it, I must imagine their time and attention divided between three different circles. Either they spoke in places of public resort, where unconverted Jews composed the principal part of their audience, or at least that to which they exclusively addressed themselves, or in private meetings of the believers, in which, if there was no greater number of gradations, there was at least a distinction between the general assemblies of the converts and a select society to which the apostles admitted only their most familiar disciples, whom they were preparing to become their assistants and representatives. In their addresses to the unbelieving Jews, their ordinary topic was undoubtedly the accomplishment of the prophecies relating to the Messiah in the person and life of Jesus. But the character of these discourses must have been polemical, or at least argumentative. The great difficulty lay in surmounting the prejudices of their hearers, in opening their eyes to the substance of figures and types which had impressed them with erroneous notions of the character and office of the expected national deliverer, and so enabling them to apply the language of the prophets to things and events to which it did not always at first sight appear to correspond. The leading features of the history of Jesus, and particularly the concluding scenes of His life, were matter of public notoriety, and did not require to be directly related, still less to be circumstantially described on these occasions, but could only be slightly alluded to, as in the speech of Peter (Acts iii. 12-26), which may be considered a specimen of the mode in which the apostles generally treated the subject. And even if they had frequently entered into details before this class of hearers, the narrative could never have been extricated from the controversial elements so as to compose a direct history; still less

[n] Einleitung, § 87, b.

could the variety of forms and expressions arising from the multiplicity of occasions on which these discourses were delivered by different persons be reduced to a single common formula. On the other hand, in the larger assemblies of the church, where the general truth that Jesus is the Christ was admitted, the object of the apostles would be to build on this foundation, and to instruct the new converts in the relation which the religion of Jesus bore to the old Law, and to explain to them the nature of His kingdom, and the characteristics of His genuine followers. In the variety of topics comprised under these heads, they might undoubtedly have frequent occasion to draw illustration and confirmation of their doctrines from the actions, and still more from the discourses of their Master. But here not only was there wanting that unity of design which in discourses tending to the single point of proving Jesus to be the Messiah might be supposed to produce a conformity of thought and expression even among different speakers, but there would be still greater difficulty in separating the text from the comment; and still less probability that the wish to do so should occur to any of the hearers; for the narratives and recitals would be commonly subordinate and incidental to the general argument, and derive from it their chief weight and meaning. Hence I cannot conceive that our Gospels represent in a literal sense the public preaching of the apostles. In their private intercourse with one another and their most confidential scholars, the scenes they had witnessed and the speeches they had heard, as they undoubtedly formed their most delightful recollections, might also be frequently the theme of conversation; and on these occasions they might sometimes be led to gratify the curiosity of their friends by anecdotes, of which they had heard perhaps but a confused report, and wished to learn the exact details. And that to these communications we are indebted for some passages of our Gospels is not improbable; though when we consider how fully the time of the apostles was occupied in superintending the spiritual and temporal concerns of a large and rapidly increasing community, we shall not be disposed to expect many such instances, and still less to assign this as the origin of a collection embracing the whole public life of Jesus".[o]

[o] Introduction by the translator of Schleiermacher's Essay on Luke, pp. 129-13

The objection contained in this long paragraph could not be abridged without lessening its force, and we have therefore presented it in the words of the learned writer himself.

Looking at these objections, we may naturally ask, What additional aid must be summoned for the purpose of supplementing the hypothesis of an oral Gospel? There are certain verbal phenomena too singular to be explained by it alone, however far it may go towards a satisfactory solution of their appearance. We may therefore suppose, that the Greek translator of Matthew used the Gospels of Mark and Luke, where the matter in the Aramaean was so like the matter of the two evangelists, as to warrant its being rendered into corresponding or coincident language. We know that the Hebrew original, written by Matthew himself, contained *substantially* the same narratives and the same discourses, and wherever they approximated somewhat closely to those given by Mark and Luke, the translator made use of the Greek expressions already current. This circumstance, additional to the hypothesis of an exclusively oral tradition, serves to explain what we should consider inexplicable otherwise, except by adopting the supplementary in addition to the oral hypothesis, and in so doing creating new difficulties for the sake of removing a single one.

In regard to the second objection urged by De Wette, it is certainly unlikely that the apostles related in one discourse, or in a connected train of discourses, the whole series of events comprised in any one of the Gospels. They must have narrated parts of the history as the occasion required. They selected sayings uttered by Jesus, or actions which he performed, according to the exigencies of each case that arose, or the peculiarities of their hearers. Whence then arises the correspondence observable in the general plan and compass of the oral Gospel embodied in the three canonical writings? This phenomenon we are inclined to attribute mainly to the writers themselves, guided as they were by the oral tradition from which they derived their materials, and which they must have often heard in its different parts at different times along with the introductory circumstances, forming transitions from one event or discourse to another, and

directed by the apostles with whom two of them were familiar, as also aided in some degree by the written gospels which were circulated previously to the composition of theirs. Nor is there so great a conformity in the arrangement or compass of the three, as should lead us to look for any other combination of circumstances to account for it, than that which led to the gradual formation of an oral Gospel exhibiting a determinate form. Matthew's production contains more than Mark's or Luke's; but he does not follow chronological arrangement. There is a considerable agreement between the general sequence of Mark's and Luke's; but the special objects they had in view, and other circumstances, may have led them to adopt an arrangement somewhat different; to select some circumstances out of the oral traditions not given by Matthew, and to omit others which the latter had described. In short, the circle of events, with its general sequence, was marked out by the repetition of several together, and by the occasional groupings of various particulars relating to one head. It is thus possible to explain the general sequence and circle of the contents of the oral Gospel, as far as they are indicated by the correspondence in plan of the three synoptical ones, without resorting to the assumption that the arrangement of one was adopted from another.

The objection stated by the translator of Schleiermacher is subtle and forcible. Perhaps, however, he has inferred too much from the very few specimens of apostolic preaching, if it may be called so, given in the Acts of the apostles, making his subjective views too imperious in their requirement of a certain course of procedure on the part of the apostles. We cannot avoid thinking, that he has attributed too much of the controversial element to the apostles' discourses amid their various labours at Jerusalem. He admits, that in the bosom of the church itself, in confidential intercourse with the disciples whose minds were being prepared for the propagation of Christianity, they indulged in direct recitals of the life and actions of Jesus; but it is contended that their public ministrations must have assumed another character. We cannot deny, that in confronting the Jews, they frequently adduced passages from the Old Testament, commenting on them,

and shewing their fulfilment in Jesus of Nazareth; but surely it is not improbable, that even on these occasions they associated a plain statement of particular events in the life of Christ with the argumentative. They would exercise prudence in not continuing the controversial tone throughout, but in endeavouring to remove the ignorance of their opponents by calm statement and unsophisticated details. Besides, it is not likely that they came very frequently into collision with Jews disposed to listen to them long in controversy. On the other hand, it is probable that they came in contact with a class, who though partially opposed, were also willing to hear lengthened recitals, to whom direct narrative was better adapted than disputation. Perhaps the majority of Jews whom they encountered were of the latter description. In the larger assemblies of the church, the discourses and actions of Jesus would be appropriate as leading topics. The English translator conceives, that the new converts would require to be instructed in the relation which the religion of Jesus bore to the old law, in the nature of his kingdom, and the characteristics of his genuine followers, which is certainly true; but such would not, as we imagine, be required during the earliest existence of the church at Jerusalem. For though the members of it admitted the general truth that Jesus was the Christ, they must have been ignorant to a large extent of the actions and discourses that demonstrated him to be such. They must have had a very imperfect apprehension of the basis on which belief in his Messiahship rested; and it was therefore of the highest importance that they should be well acquainted with the public ministry of their Lord. In process of time, the topics best suited to their spiritual state would be those specified by the translator; but while the oral Gospel was being spontaneously formed — while it was acquiring a determinate, stereotyped shape, we apprehend that the simple narration of what Jesus was, what he did and what he said as a public teacher, was more adapted to the condition of the newly-gathered church, and therefore more likely to be adopted by the apostles. The oral Gospel, which constituted the source of our canonical ones, must have been formed to a great extent before the communication of that higher instruction which our author supposes.

In advocating the traditional hypothesis, we are not insensible to the improper use made of it by many German writers, most of all perhaps by Strauss, who attributes to tradition a modifying power, and assigns it a length of time before the canonical Gospels appeared, by which the evangelical history becomes the result of subjective reflection. Such must be the opinion virtually of those who stretch the traditionary period into the second century. But historical testimony must be abandoned before this extension can be allowed. In considering the number of years during which oral tradition served as the vehicle of the evangelical history, we must not throw contempt on the evidence of antiquity.

It accords with all the circumstances of the age to suppose, that the apostles did not consider it a part of their ordinary ministry to teach by *written* documents. The age was illiterate. They belonged for the most part to a class of society unpractised in the art of writing. Oral communication was the only medium of public instruction which entered into the original plan of their ministrations. The epistles of the New Testament evidently presuppose this fact; while the manner in which the apostles provided for the transmission of religious truth from their own disciples to others, teaches the same thing. They were preachers of the living word commissioned to go forth into the world, and to make known orally the great doctrines of Christianity. In one instance we read of a short letter sent from the apostles to the churches of a district; but this arose out of unusual circumstances, and was manifestly an exception to the general rule. Nor was any necessity for written documents felt by the early Christians for a considerable time, even had they been generally able to read them. While the apostles and evangelists could supply their wants so efficiently, the need of instruction in another form was imperceptible.

We have already spoken of the probability of written records or Gospels before the appearance of the canonical Gospel of Matthew. But those smaller works must have been composed in the first instance for private use. They were produced on temporary occasions, their value depending on the character of their authors. That they served to imprint the wonderful scenes con-

nected with Christ's ministry on their own minds, and to afford instruction to others in various cases, is beyond doubt; but still they were inaccurate and incomplete to some extent, however good the intentions with which they were composed. These writings certainly indicate some desire among the converts for information respecting the life of Christ—a life which affected them with so much wonder, and of which they had heard from the first preachers of Christianity. Anxiety not to lose the knowledge of scenes so amazing and unusual, gave rise to memoranda of them. But as long as the apostles continued in Judea, unconscious of the Gospel's universal character in a great measure, the want of an authorised written Gospel could not be much felt. The Jews to which they were enjoined to preach first, and whose prejudices they had to overcome by shewing the accomplishment of the Jewish Scriptures in Jesus of Nazareth, would naturally require first a written account of the Redeemer's life. Still there was no immediate necessity even for that, till the circumstances of Judea seemed to demand it. It was not till the apostles were about to be dispersed in different countries, in order that the divine word might be diffused abroad, that the traditional Gospel, or Aramaean cycle of events which it comprised, required to be left in a fixed and tangible form. Oral tradition might perhaps have preserved the transactions in a safe condition for a longer period; but Matthew was about to leave Judea for ever; and since he had laboured mainly among his countrymen, he could not think of leaving them possessed of a merely oral Gospel that must be partially fluctuating. They had been accustomed to *Scriptures*—sacred writings forming an infallible standard—and however much the simplicity of those documents had been obscured by Rabbinical traditions, some partiality for tangible documents must have been fostered by them. This is confirmed by Eusebius, who says that when Matthew was about to leave Palestine, he left the believing Jews a Gospel written in their native language. After a few years, the Gospels of Mark and Luke followed, which were designed for other readers. If therefore we be disposed to regard ancient historical evidence, we must assign less than twenty years to the traditionary period, as far as the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew is concerned, and about thirty years as regards

those of Mark and Luke. *The former* period is certainly too brief for a mythical origin of their contents; and although the negative critics think the space of *thirty years*, during which oral tradition was the only source of evangelical knowledge, to be sufficient for that hypothesis, they will find it impossible to persuade impartial inquirers of the correctness of their opinion. Leaving out of view the Aramaean Gospel of Matthew, which must have been confined almost exclusively to Palestine; or granting, for the sake of argument, that it did not appear till about the same time with Luke's, that is nearly thirty years after the death of Jesus, the oral Gospel must have undergone an amazing process if the views of our opponents be correct. But the mode in which religious knowledge was handed down, the surprising accuracy with which the traditions of the Jews had been transmitted, the simplicity of the age unambitious of ornament and illiterate, are adverse to the views of the negative critics. Besides, the apostles were recognised as authorised guides. They watched over the oral Gospel, and were able to correct false statements. Other eye and ear-witnesses of many events incorporated into the traditions were still living, and many of the scenes were fresh in their recollection from the marvellous character belonging to them. An importance also, as well as a seriousness, blended intimately with this knowledge, guarding it from capricious alterations. The primitive Christians had a deep and sacred reverence for the person of Christ, both competent and disposed to preserve the knowledge of his discourses and actions in the pure state in which they received it. The earliest churches considered themselves the depositaries of the ἱερὸς λόγος, superintended as they were by apostles or by their immediate disciples. All our information concerning them and their presbyters, with the disposition they manifested in regard to the holy traditions relative to Jesus, shews that they were *faithful guardians* of the accounts received from credible witnesses. While therefore we cannot allow to tradition the wild and lawless caprices attributed to it by Weisse, Wilke, and Bauer, or the surprising power assigned by Strauss, we are unable to adopt the more moderate view of De Wette, who looks upon it not simply as a conserving vehicle, carefully transmitting the facts and discourses

contained in the life of Jesus, but as an elaborating agency, by virtue of which many things were moulded in new shapes, or fashioned in the free spirit of independent inquiry. It is true that the historic cycle was not absolutely stereotyped; that there were many variations and discrepancies, either in the less important particulars, or in those which had not been often repeated among the apostles in the bosom of the church at Jerusalem, but yet the spirit of those who adopted Christianity was more reverent and conservative than to cast the Gospel into a new mould, adding to it many things derived from reflection and enthusiasm. We are reminded indeed of the fact, that the historical interest of the narrators and hearers was by no means *critical*, however lively in degree; but its uncritical character is favourable to the supposition of its being scrupulous in retaining the traditions as they were received. Had the early Christians been literary in their mental habitudes, we might have expected the fact assumed by De Wette; but the reverent simplicity of their character, beside the poverty of the dialect in which they heard the history, and their want of complete mastery over it, are adverse to the assumption. We will not affirm, that the mode in which the evangelical history was perpetuated till the appearance of written Gospels by duly qualified persons, had *no* influence on the mode in which certain parts of the sacred documents appeared; but a comprehensive view of the period when Christianity was first promulgated favours the belief, that the mode of transmission had no *distorting* effect on any part of the historic cycle.

And here a circumstance should be taken into account, which though often overlooked, is of no small importance. The promise recorded in John's Gospel (xiv. 26), secured infallibility on the part of the apostles to whom it was given. Whatever meaning may be attached to the prediction, one thing is clear, that it secured the minds of those to whom it belonged from material error, enabling them to give a faithful account of what they had heard. They were not liable to failure of memory in regard to the truths of Christianity, or the principles enunciated by its Founder; but were under the continued influence of the enlightening Spirit, who led them to a correct apprehension of all that

related to moral truth. By virtue of this promise, an unusual elevation of mind belonged to the apostles. They were *inspired.* This fact must have had an important bearing on their teachings, oral and written. They were thus conducted in the true way, so that the representations given of the words of Jesus must have been *substantially accurate*, agreeably to the genius of the two languages with which they had to do.

Here it may be proper to refer to a recent attempt[p] to overthrow the mythic theory by a new argument, which aims at proving a different period for the composition of the Gospels and of the epistles—an early date for the former, and one *considerably later* for the latter.

The proposer's object is to shew, that the names by which the Saviour is designated in the Gospel and in the epistles respectively differ in such a manner as to demonstrate the priority of the date belonging to the one division of the New Testament compared with the other. "There are," says he, "two distinct usages as to the terms by which the Saviour of the world is designated in the New Testament. They divide the sacred nine (for John counts twice) into two groups, comprising the following names:—The 1st, Matthew, Mark, Luke (his Gospel and Acts), and John; the 2nd, Paul, James, Peter, John (*i. e.*, as an epistolographer, presenting variations from the nomenclature of his Gospel), and Jude. The characteristic of the first group is, that they *habitually* call the Saviour *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ;* while that of the second group is, that they as *habitually* designate Him by *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ* with *ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ* conjoined, or by *ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ* alone." *Jesus* is simply the name of "the Man of Nazareth;" but the name "Jesus" being united with "Christ," or "Christ" alone substituted in the place of "Jesus," bespeaks a higher conception of the Saviour's dignity; and therefore the compositions in which *Jesus* is habitually employed, must have preceded, by a considerable portion of time, the other compositions in which *Jesus Christ* or *Christ* occurs.

The following observations will shew the baselessness of the entire argument:—

1. At the commencement of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark,

[p] Tentamen Anti-Straussianum: by O. T. Dobbin, LL.D., 8vo.

Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς is the first appellation applied to the Redeemer. Here, if any where, we should expect the prevailing usage of the time at which the sacred documents were written, because the designation inserted in that place forms the title or inscription of the whole. At the head of their works, the historians mark out Jesus as the well-known, recognised historical Person alluded to in "Messiah" or "Christ." If, therefore, a different usage prevail in the Gospels themselves; if the name "Jesus" appear in their narratives, instead of "Christ," or "Jesus Christ" in the inscriptions, the presumption is, that the authors adapted the appellations to the subject. In the history itself, referring, as it does, to a period prior to the decided and general recognition of the Redeemer's dignity, the proper name "Christ" would not have been exactly suitable; whereas, placed at *the head* of the Gospels as a kind of inscription, it is highly appropriate by the side of a contrary usage in *the body* of the Gospels themselves, provided the later standing point of the writers be allowed. Every thing is natural on the supposition that Χριστὸς was common among Christians, as an appellation of the Saviour, when Matthew and Mark wrote; just as it seems to have been when the apostle Paul addressed his epistles to the various churches.

2. In the Apocalypse, Ἰησοῦς occurs eight times, but Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς only five times. The date of the book is thus brought to the time when the Gospels were written, considerably before the composition of the epistles. But those who can believe that the book should be placed in the Gospel-period, viewed as separated from the epistolary period by a wide interval of time, must shut their eyes to all internal and external evidence. Nothing indeed appears plainer, than that it cannot be thrown back so early as the date of the first three Gospels *so considered.*

In the epistle to the Hebrews, Ἰησοῦς is found nine times, Χριστὸς nine times, and Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς three times; so that the usage of both is nearly alike.

When, therefore, we look at the usage of the Apocalypse and that of the epistle to the Hebrews, they must be exceptions to the rule propounded.

3. The apostles and early Christians do not seem to have discriminated in the mode we are taught by the rule to find them

doing, between these different appellations; for in the same discourse (Acts iii. 12-26) *Ἰησοῦς* occurs but once; whereas *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς*, and *Χριστὸς* alone, occur once each. Hence the apostle Peter employed them in speech without distinction. In the act of healing the impotent man, which gave rise to the discourse in question, he even says *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*. Certainly the Gospels were not written at the time Peter thus spoke. The same fact is corroborated by Acts xxviii. 23 compared with the thirty-first verse.

4. If the history contained in the Acts be brought down to the second year of Paul's imprisonment, the book could scarcely have been written before A. D. 63. Dr. Burton, however, thought that it was written between 56 and 58. Whichever view be taken of this point, as well as of the question of a first and second captivity, thus much is certain, that the epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, were written before the Acts of the Apostles. Now, according to the author of the argument, the latter book belongs to the Gospel-period, by virtue of a certain *usus-loquendi* in it, and that Gospel-period must be separated by a considerable interval from the epistolary period. Hence his argument must be unsound.

Let us mark the state of the case regarding the Acts of the Apostles. That book was written, without doubt, *after* the epistles just enumerated. According to our author's view, it should exhibit the same usage relative to the appellations of the Saviour. It should even be more emphatic in proportion to the time. But *Ἰησοῦς* occurs thirty-five times in the Acts; whereas the compound *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς* is found only eighteen times, and *Χριστὸς* alone seven times.

5. It is particularly unphilosophical and one-sided to make this single point overrule all internal and external evidence connected with the various books of the New Testament. To exalt it thus, is to convert a most ambiguous criterion into an importance which it cannot intrinsically claim.

Other considerations might be stated in opposition to the novel argument proposed, were it needful to speak of it at any length: its futility, however, can hardly escape the reflecting mind. If Strauss' mythic theory, which it has been thought triumphantly

to demolish, have nothing more forcible against it, its validity remains unimpaired. It is utterly contrary to all the phenomena connected with the Gospels to suppose them written thirty years before the Epistles. The composition of both must be brought together, else the Epistles will be carried down to a period subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem.

NOTES.

Note I.—Page 3.

There are two points respecting Papias and John the presbyter, which demand investigation. It may be asked —

First. Is it sufficiently certain that there were two persons — John the apostle and evangelist, and John the presbyter? And if there be evidence for distinguishing between them, it may be inquired

Secondly. Was Papias a disciple of the apostle, or of the presbyter?

We subjoin a few remarks on each question.

First. Eusebius introduces Papias saying in the preface of a work now lost: *εἰ δέ που καί παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας, ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν, ἢ τί Φίλιππος, ἢ τί Θωμᾶς, ἢ Ἰάκωβος· ἢ τί Ἰωάννες, ἢ Ματθαῖος, ἢ τίς ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἅ τε Ἀριστίων, καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν*[a]. "But if I met with any one who had been a follower of the elders any where, I made it a point to inquire what were the declarations of the elders; what was said by Andrew, Peter, or Philip; what by Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other of the disciples of our Lord; what was said by Aristion, and the presbyter John, disciples of the Lord," etc. Here Papias speaks first of apostles, mentioning John among others; and then introduces Aristion and *John the presbyter* as distinct from them. It has been said indeed on the other side, that Papias speaks first of apostles, and what they had done, etc.; after which he immediately mentions Aristion and John (the same John of whom he had before spoken), as those who, having seen the Lord, were personally known to himself. John the apostle might well be mentioned twice, for Papias first speaks of those of whom he had learned through others, and of what he had so learned. Now John was one of whom he might have heard much besides what he learned *from* him. This explanation is apparently favoured by Eusebius' remark: *καὶ ὁ νῦν δὲ ἡμῖν δηλούμενος Παπίας, τοὺς μὲν τῶν ἀποστόλων λόγους παρὰ τῶν αὐτοῖς παρηκολουθηκότων ὁμολογεῖ παρειληφέναι, Ἀριστίωνος δὲ καὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Ἰωάννου, αὐτήκοον ἑαυτὸν φησὶ γενέσθαι*[b]. "And

[a] H. E. iii. 39. [b] Ibid.

the same Papias, of whom we now speak, professes to have received the declarations of the apostles from those that were in company with them; and says also, that he was a hearer of Aristion and John the presbyter." At the same time, the aorist *εἶπεν* in the one case, and *λέγουσιν* the present tense, in the other, may appear to favour the same conclusion.

But yet it must always look strange, that *ὁ πρεσβύτερος* should be prefixed to *Ἰωάννης* on his second mention, as if *Ἰωάννης* simply were not sufficient. Surely the epithet favours the view of those critics who regard it as a note of distinction in this particular case between the John now mentioned and him who was numbered among the apostles. And then, too, it is somewhat remarkable, that Aristion should be mentioned *before* the apostle John, on the supposition that the second John was not different from the first. Eusebius himself certainly understood Papias to speak of two persons, as is manifest from the following words: *ἔνθα καὶ ἐπιστῆσαι ἄξιον δὶς καταριθμοῦντι αὐτῷ τὸ Ἰωάννου ὄνομα· ὧν τὸν μὲν πρότερον Πέτρῳ καὶ Ἰακώβῳ καὶ Ματθαίῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις συγκαταλέγει, σαφῶς δηλῶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστήν· τὸν δ' ἕτερον Ἰωάννην διαστείλας τὸν λόγον, ἑτέροις παρὰ τὸν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀριθμὸν κατατάσσει, προτάξας αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἀριστίωνα. Σαφῶς τε αὐτὸν πρεσβύτερον ὀνομάζει. Ὡς καὶ διὰ τούτων ἀποδείκνυσθαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀληθῆ, τῶν δύο κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ὁμωνυμίᾳ κεχρῆσθαι εἰρηκότων, δύο τε ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου ἔτι νῦν λέγεσθαι· οἷς καὶ ἀναγκαῖον προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν*[c]. "Where it is also proper to observe, that the name of John is twice mentioned, the former of which he mentions with Peter, and James, and Matthew, and the other apostles; evidently meaning the evangelist. But in a separate point of his discourse he ranks the other John with the rest not included in the number of apostles, placing Aristion before him. He distinguishes him plainly by the name of presbyter. So that it is here proved, that the statement of those is true who assert that there were two of the same name in Asia; that there were also two tombs in Ephesus, and that both are called the tomb of John even to this day; which it is particularly necessary to observe."

Guerike himself[d], who once argued most plausibly against the existence of John the presbyter as distinct from the apostle, has since abandoned the opinion; and we are not aware of any good critic who

[c] H. E. iii. 39.

[d] Die Hypothese von dem Presbyter Johannes als Verfasser der Offenbarung geprüft u. s. w. p. 4, et seqq.; and Einleitung, p. 262, note 4.

denies at the present day their separate personality. Credner[e] and Wieseler[f] have nearly silenced doubters.

Secondly. It is plain that Eusebius considered Papias to have been a hearer of John the presbyter, not of the apostle. But the testimony of Irenaeus seems opposed to this: Παπίας Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονὼς, ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, ἐγγράφως ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ, κ. τ. λ.[g] "Papias, a hearer of John and the associate of Polycarp, an ancient man, testifies in writing," etc. Here it is argued, that the simple designation "a hearer of John," can mean no other than the apostle. If any other had been intended, some intimation of the kind would be almost required. Eusebius himself appears to have understood Irenaeus' language of John *the apostle.* But the language of Papias himself, though not perhaps sufficiently explicit to warrant Eusebius' inference, appears to us to favour that inference. And if Irenaeus, as is probable, meant to say that Papias was the disciple of John the apostle, he appears to have been mistaken. As an inference from Papias' own words, the opinion is unquestionably erroneous. Probably Irenaeus thought that as Papias was the companion of Polycarp, and as the latter was a hearer of the apostle, the former must have been so too. The bishop of Lyons had not the same interest in the point before us as the historian. The latter seems to have considered it more closely. Hence he scruples not to differ from the former. And we attach more weight to his sentiments. Certainly the gross millennarianism of Papias is not very consistent with the idea of his having been a disciple of John the apostle.

We need not enter farther on a question respecting which the evidence is so precarious. An examination of the notices contained in the fathers has led us to the conclusion, that Papias was not a hearer of John, or of any of the twelve. After all that has been written by Halloix[h], Grabe[i], Guerike[k], Olshausen[l], Danz[m], and others, we have no fear of their opinion ever again becoming general. The best critics are now agreed, that Papias could not have been a disciple of John, else he profited nothing by his instructions.

Grabe harmonises Eusebius' and Irenaeus' opinions by making Papias a hearer of both Johns, which is utterly improbable.

[e] Einleit. p. 694, et seqq.
[f] In the Theol. Mitarbeit. iii. 4, p. 213, et seqq.
[g] Ap. Euseb. H. E., iii. 39.
[h] Illustr. Orient. Eccles. Scriptor. Vitae.
[i] Spicilegium, Seculum ii.
[k] Die Hypothese, u. s. w.
[l] Die Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien.
[m] De Eusebio Caesariensi historiae ecclesiasticae scriptore, ejusque fide historica recte aestimanda disputatio, etc.

Note II.—Page 42.

Here the argument turns on the right meaning of the expressions *τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν* and *τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις*. Pfannkuche explains *the latter*, "Jews in Babylon, Persia, Arabia, and beyond the Euphrates." This meaning commends itself to all interpreters. Josephus himself tells us who these *ἄνω βαρβάροι* were immediately after, when he describes them as *Πάρθους μὲν καὶ Βαβυλωνίους, Ἀράβων τε τοὺς πορρωτάτω, καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ Εὐφράτην ὁμόφηλον ἡμῖν, κ. τ. λ.* Hence Hudson and Havercamp translate the phrase *mediterraneis barbaris*, or superioris continentis incolas. *The former expression* is applied by Pfannkuche not to the Jews, but to the Greeks and the numerous Romans who were acquainted with the Greek tongue. Hence it favours our view of the vernacular language of the Jews in Palestine. But Diodati understands it very differently. He refers it to *the Jews* who lived under the Roman empire, i. e. *who inhabited Palestine.* In his opinion the Jews living beyond the Euphrates are contrasted with the Jews of Palestine, *τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις*, with *τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν*. Hence the Jews of Palestine used Greek, not Hebrew, as their native tongue. But the opinion of Diodati appears to be erroneous, when Josephus himself is consulted. It is necessary to look at the entire passage from which the right meaning of *τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις* is derived, since it is simply an explanatory comment on the words before us. The historian states, that he thought it preposterous that his countrymen beyond the Euphrates should be made acquainted with the history of the Jewish war, *ἀγνοεῖν δὲ Ἕλληνας ταῦτα καὶ Ῥωμαίων τοὺς μὴ ἐπιστρατευσαμένους, κ. τ. λ.* "but that the Greeks and those of the Romans not engaged in the war should be ignorant of the same transactions." Hence the historian refers to *Greeks*, not *Jews*, as the persons for whom he turned his history into Greek. They were Greeks, and such others throughout the Roman dominion as used the language of the Greeks, whom Josephus had in view, and to whom he alludes in the words *τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν.*

Note III.—Page 50.

The antiquity of the Peshito is difficult to be determined. It has been frequently asserted that it was made in the latter half of the first,

or the beginning of the second century. But this age is too high. It should be assigned to the middle or second half of the second century, at which time the Aramaean Gospel of Matthew had passed almost exclusively into the hands of persons whose orthodoxy was suspicious in the eyes of the Catholic Christians.

My friend Mr. Tregelles, whose opinion is entitled to great weight, is persuaded that this version does not exhibit any thing like its original text. "Whoever," says he, "inserted in it the Eusebian canons, as found in most or all the MSS., *may* have introduced alterations from the Greek MS. before him. At all events, the Gospels have been made more harmonious and accordant, in the same way as the later Greek MSS. The Nitrian MSS. when collated may exhibit perhaps an earlier text. I collated the whole of the most ancient of Rich's MSS., letter by letter, but the variations were immaterial; they mostly consisted of *grammatical peculiarities*—but even this brought out one fact—that the Syrian scribes are addicted to *mending* what they have to copy."

Note IV.—Page 145.

As Fritzsche was the first modern critic who approached the right view of the expression *interpreter of Peter*, we subjoin his note:—"Marcum Petri ἑρμηνευτήν, *interpretem* idcirco a Patribus dici, quod Petri linguae Graecae parum gnari sermones aramaicos Apostoli auditoribus et discipulis graece interpretatus fuerit *Eichhornius* l. c. p. 597. *Bertholdtus* l. l. p. 1277, et *Kuinoelius*, l. l. p. 2, existimant. Sed hanc mihi interpretationem falsam videri fateor, qui sic censeam, Marcum Petri interpretem vocari quod eorum quae Petrus ore voceque docuisset summam literis consignatam Evangelio suo complexus fuerit discipulus, ut res Petri verba Marci recte censeantur. Nihil illorum sententiae, permulta nostrae favere videntur. Et primum quidem argumentor ex Euseb. H E. iii. 39. καὶ τοῦθ' ὁ πρεσβύτερος (Johannes) ἔλεγε. Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα· οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δὲ ὡς ἔφην Πέτρῳ· [at Marcum Petrum sectatum esse magistrum non antea dixerat: apparet igitur h. l. verba Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος respici atque ea de discipulo qui a magistro audita literis mandaverit explicanda esse. Docent hoc etiam quae proxime

sequuntur:] *ὅς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ' ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων.* [Nihil igitur quod supervacaneum videri posset Marcum fecisse quum quae Petrus ore tradidisset eorum memoriam literis consignaret significavit scriptor]. *Ὥστε οὐδὲν ἥμαρτε Μάρκος οὕτως ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. Ἑνὸς γὰρ ἐποιεῖτο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε* [scil. *a Petro, magistro suo, cujus institutionem libro suo comprehendere constituisset*] *παραλιπεῖν ἢ ψεύσασθαί τι ἐν αὐτοῖς.* Deinde sententiam meam comprobat locus Hieronymi epist. ad Hedibiam, cap. ix. *Habebat ergo* [Paulus in posteriore ad Corinthios epistolâ scribendâ] *Titum interpretem, sicut et beatus Petrus Marcum, cujus Evangelium Petro narrante et illo scribente compositum est. Denique et duae epistolae quae feruntur Petri stilo inter se et charactere discrepant structuraque verborum, ex quo intelligimus pro necessitate rerum diversis eum usum* INTERPRETIBUS. Tum a partium studio alienus haec loca perpende: Hieron. de viris illustribus, cap. 8. Marcus *discipulus et* INTERPRES PETRI JUXTA QUOD PETRUM REFERENTEM AUDIERAT rogatus Romae a fratribus *breve scripsit Evangelium* (ibid. cap. i). Sed et Evangelium juxta Marcum, qui *auditor ejus* (Petri) *et interpres* fuit, *hujus* (Petri) *dicitur.* Irenaeus contra Haereses iii. 10, 6. Quapropter et Marcus *interpres et sectator* Petri initium evangelicae conscriptionis fecit sic, etc. (Euseb. 5, 8). *μετὰ τὴν τούτων* (Petri et Pauli) *ἔξοδον Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε,* (6, 25). *δεύτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ ποιήσαντα ὃν καὶ υἱὸν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ διὰ τούτων ὡμολόγησε φάσκων· ἀσπάζεται, κ. τ. λ.* (Tertull. adv. Marcion, 4, 5).—Licet et Marcus quod edidit Evangelium *Petri* affirmatur, *cujus interpres Marcus. Capit magistrorum videri quae discipuli promulgarint.* Caeterum commentitiam hanc esse de Marco Petri interprete famam ex iis intelligetur quae § 2. dicentur" (Prolegomena in Comment. Marci, pp. 26, 27).

THE END.

WERTHEIMER AND CO., PRINTERS, CIRCUS PLACE, FINSBURY.

00059283

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 17 February, 2016